The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1919 No. 2803

The Week

THE student of diplomatic history will attach a high value to the dispatch sent by the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in Berlin to his Government on July 27, 1914, and now made public by the Serbian Minister to France. It appears in the *Journal des Débats*, though the press cables do not explain how so invaluable a message should have come into the possession of a Serbian diplomatist. It is brief and brutal:

> The Secretary of State has just declared to me positively, but under the seal of the strictest secrecy, that very soon eventual propositions of mediation from England will be brought to the knowledge of your Excellency. The German Government assures me in the most convincing manner that it in no way identifies itself with these propositions, that it is absolutely against their being taken into consideration, and that it will only transmit them to give effect to the English request.

If this document is authentic, it substantiates the most extreme belief as to the unmitigated guilt of the German Foreign Office in prompting Austria to war. It is not the final stone in the complete mosaic of evidence, for there is still no adequate exposé of the Potsdam conference. Herr Haase, the Minority Socialist, who first openly charged that the war was voted at this conference, had only reports to go by; and Herr von Wangenheim, who confided the story of Potsdam to his colleague at Constantinople, Mr. Morgenthau, had no first-hand knowledge, and had, moreover, a notoriously loose and inaccurate tongue. Indubitably a full understanding existed, however, between the German and Austrian Governments; for the new dispatch admits of no other conclusion. The Serbian Minister also publishes a message from the same Ambassador, dated July 25, 1914, containing this sentence: "We are counselled with the greatest insistence to pass immediately to action and thus face the world with an accomplished fact." But as the dispatch does not name the author of these counsels it cannot be regarded as proof, in an historical sense.

WHILE the Administration flounders in the errors of its Russian policy, American business men are getting nervous, and are beginning to see a light. It is one thing stanchly to refuse to have dealings with the Bolsheviki, and incidentally to back certain great financial interests in their first steps toward the exploitation of the vast natural resources of Siberia; it is quite another thing if this policy blocks the development of legitimate trade relations between the United States and the greater part of Russia. A good deal of time has gone by, and the Soviet Government remains. Russia needs goods, and can pay for them. It may be that a mistake has been made, and that the Soviet Government is going to endure. Thus reasons the American business man. He wonders why he cannot find out the truth. He knows that the State Department is controlling his news of the Russian situation; and, since he is not a fool, he recognizes that the State Department, if it has made such a gross error in Russian policy as now seems probable, will be chiefly concerned in covering up that error. He is beginning to believe that if he could get into Russia he would find a country in a fairly orderly condition, ready for self-development and clamoring for trade. But he cannot get into Russia; the Administration holds him out. On top of this comes the news from England that the British Government is advising its trade interests to revive their Russian connections, in view of certain changes in policy which are bound to come about. There is talk of the establishment of a new steamship company to run between England and Russia. All this disturbs the American business man most seriously. While America foams at the mouth over Bolshevism, he sees British trade reaching out for the Russian markets. And he asks himself this pertinent question: Must legitimate trade relations between America and Russia be sacrificed to the errors of an inadequate diplomatic service and to the interests of the forces of financial exploitation?

THE first by-elections in England reveal the factitiousness of Mr. Lloyd-George's power. West Leyton, in December, cast 11,000 votes for a Coalitionist and 5,000 for an independent Liberal; now it elects the Liberal by a majority of 2,000. A fourth of the voters changed their minds within three months. In Liverpool, a Unionist was re-elected, but by a greatly decreased majority. Little attempt has been made to ascribe these results to any cause but growing discontent. The vote in December was not for the man Lloyd-George but for an indemnity. It was the expression of a selfish furore, now passed. But the mad moment produced its Parliament, in which the Prime Minister is more than safe. And the elastic British Constitution provides little relief for an electorate that so swiftly changes its mind. It is an unhealthy condition, and it is likely to add rather alarming numbers to the believers in direct action.

THE Canadian Parliament, which has been in session for about four weeks, has thus far been marking time. The debate on the address from the throne, the only business as yet formally before the House of Commons, has ranged as usual over a variety of topics, the chief popular interest centring in a severe attack by General Sir Sam Hughes upon the use of certain Canadian forces abroad. The attack, to which vigorous replies have been made, was given additional point by the news of the revolt of Canadian troops in Wales and outspoken complaints of conditions on several returning transports. The budget has not yet been laid before the House, and the Government policy in general has not been foreshadowed. Meantime the Premier, Sir Robert Borden, remains in France, ostensibly detained by the need of attendance upon the peace conference, but at the same time none too anxious, it is intimated, to face the storm of questions and criticism which is certain to burst on his return. The political situation in general is extraordinary. Notwithstanding the armistice, the rapid return of troops from foreign service, and the beginnings at least of demobilization and reconstruction, Canada continues to be ruled, not by Parliament, but by Orders in Council, some of which have

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not even been printed; while the open scandals of the last election and the continued repression of freedom of speech and publication have bred a deep-seated hostility to the present Unionist Government which, while it may be mitigated, cannot be wholly removed. The Liberals, unfortunately, are without a leader now that Sir Wilfred Laurier is no more; what is worse, they are divided, as the existence of a Unionist Government shows. Even if the Unionist coalition goes to pieces during the present session, as is not unlikely, it is not clear what kind of leadership the reuniting of the party may evolve. Of the issues before the country the most important, next to the overthrow of the Borden Government and the remedying of the abuses which it has tolerated or actually established, is tariff reduction; while in the programme of reconstruction the return of the soldiers to agricultural or industrial life holds first place. The hopeful element at the moment consists of the farmers of Ontario and the West, who at last, after long waiting, are organizing for political action.

THE delegates to the Western Canada Labor Conference, representing unions belonging to the American Federation of Labor, have voted unanimously in favor of a proletarian dictatorship "as a means of transforming society from a capitalistic to a communal basis," and have formed what is to be known as "The One Big Union." The authority lies with five directors, already chosen, who are preparing at once a referendum as to secession from the American Federation. A challenge has been issued to the Government in the threat of a general strike on June 1 unless free speech is protected, the censorship is abolished, and political prisoners are liberated. The organization is a copy of the proposed one-big-union of all labor bodies of Australia, where a series of conferences has been held looking to the social ownership of the means of production. Events in Russia, Germany, and Australia may not quicken the laggard American industrial leaders into a more far-sighted policy than persecution of the discontented, but the fires of western Canada will appear more ominous. The confederation of labor goes on; and it is wise to consider the economist's axiom, that the general strike is always revolutionary.

THE private boat-owners of New York have made much of the Administration's refusal to support the Macy award in the harbor strike, and in taunting the employees and the Government with bad faith they have the superficial aspects of the case to support them. But they see the mote and ignore the beam. It was these same employers who undermined the New York Harbor Wage Adjustment Board, set up by an agreement of their own which they violated several hundred times. It was these employers whom Mr. Taft asked to reconstitute this wage board as a condition to the War Labor Board's assuming jurisdiction, and who declined. It was these employers who later refused to submit to the War Labor Board in accordance with President Wilson's cable from France, and only let one of their number accede so that they might be represented by counsel at the hearings. Then when the Macy ruling turned out to their liking, and was rejected by the unions, they suddenly became champions of the doctrine of arbitration, and posed before the public as honest men betrayed by promise breakers. However unethical the conduct of the unions, however opportunistic the policy of the Administration, there can be no sympathy with this patent hyprocrisy. We do not condone the action of the unions, but it is not difficult to understand. They had struck for an eight-hour day and higher wages. The award gave no wage relief; it granted the eight-hour day to only six hundred of the sixteen thousand strikers; and it left the hours of the others to be decided in a long series of conferences with owners who were unequivocally committed against any change of hours and who had not agreed to acknowledge the award. The finding thus singularly disregarded the psychology of the situation, and had Mr. Macy realized precisely what the outcome of previous conferences had been he could never have suggested such a solution.

THE failure of arbitration in this case is due primarily to the narrow interpretation which Mr. Taft put upon the scope of the War Labor Board. He held that it was authorized to intervene only because of a war emergency, that the war was not technically concluded, and that it affected the harbor. For this reason the case had to be limited to a consideration of any change that had come subsequent to the date of the last agreement between the employers and the men. Hence the Board, instead of hearing the case on its intrinsic merits, compared the present situation with conditions of last July. Within these limits the men attempted to argue that they had accepted the July agreement, with its twelve-hour day, because of the shortage of labor—a factor no longer existent. As to long hours, their plea that the war had practically ended was made to a Board that could listen only to a war-time demand. This is an incongruous state of affairs, and it goes to prove that immediate steps must be taken, as we point out in another column, if the Board is to be maintained. In this instance there was little for the Government to do but to make concessions at the cost of consistency. It probably was recognized that the President would be hampered in Paris by an appearance of discontent at home, and Washington may not have been willing to risk a serious labor dispute in this unquiet time. It is worth mentioning that this strike is the first successful effort of several harbor unions to combine forces, and that the organizations of technical men, such as captains and engineers, not usually identified with coercive movements, were telling elements in its success.

THE drastic curtailment of the United States Employment Service, announced last week by Secretary Wilson, gives only another instance of the failure of our present governmental machinery to cope with the imperative economic factors of reconstruction. It is stated officially that owing to lack of funds the activities of this vital agency are to suffer a reduction of eighty per cent.—in other words, are practically to be discontinued. The Administration, of course, lays the blame upon Congress; President Wilson, responding in a radiogram from mid-Atlantic to a request from the Secretary of Labor for funds out of the Presidential budget, weeps crocodile tears over the situation. Says the President: "What remains (of my fund) would not suffice to maintain the bureau, and to my great grief I see no escape from disbandment." Congress quite naturally retorts that the President himself is to blame for not calling an extra session. The country at large, however, looking at the game from the outside, sees politics placed before the public welfare, and a vital function of government falling between two stools. Labor, at least, knows very well what the curtailment of the Federal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Employment Service means. It means the return of the whole matter of hiring help through agencies into the hands of those private bureaus which, in their own interests, are chiefly concerned in maintaining a certain measure of unemployment. In the face of demobilization and the disruption of industry incident to the closing of the war, and in full view of the results of unemployment throughout Europe, this failure of our governmental machinery is nothing short of disastrous. Such inadequacy is a real breeder of Bolshevism.

MAYOR Galvin's attack on the social unit plan in Cincinnati has served to call attention to the rapid spread of an interesting type of community organization. Everywhere throughout the world there are gropings after forms of representative democracy suited to twentieth-century conditions. Soviets, Whitley councils, Syndicalist and guild organs, social units, community councils, school centres, forums, even block parties, are expressions of the same tendency. The Cincinnati plan, conceived before we entered the war, rests on social organization by blocks, with a Citizens' Council representing the whole population, and an Occupational Council made up of representatives of the nine special groups represented in the thirty-one blocks so far organized—doctors, teachers, nurses, ministers, social workers, recreational experts, business men, trade unionists, and publicity workers. The experiment is now taking on national shape as the National Social Unit Organization, headed by Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane. In New York city the same general idea has taken a less intensive form in the plan for 400 community councils. Bearing the stamp of the war times in which they originated, they show their vitality by a fresh access of energy in the present reconstruction period. The movement in its many phases promises to do in a more comprehensive and democratic way what Arnold Toynbee, Edward Denison, Canon Barnett, Jane Addams, and Vida Scudder were feeling after in the eighties.

ZEALOUS patriots among our law-makers are attempting now in ten or twelve States to enact legislation, first, to prohibit the use of any foreign language in elementary grades, and, second, to bring all parochial and private schools under the jurisdiction of the State in order to enforce the first ruling. Fortunately they are everywhere meeting with violent opposition, and debates are apparently bitter. In Massachusetts the bill was opposed at a public hearing by 500 representatives of various groups. In Boston alone, there are 107 parochial schools, in twenty-two of which French is the language of instruction, in six Polish, in three German, and in three Italian. A delegate from Fall River spoke for 40,000 French, saying: "It is an attempt to make good citizens by forcing the foreigner into a strange national mould against his will—by humiliating him in some of his deepest racial feelings." In Missouri, the House of Representatives has passed a bill forbidding the teaching of any foreign language in elementary grades of both public and private schools. Here it was dubbed class legislation, a Catholic priest protesting that "many of the children of the poor cannot continue their schooling above the eighth grade, and to forbid foreign languages in the elementary grades means these children may never have instruction in any." The same Americans who were so hot for getting us into the war, with its resultant international entanglements, are to-day engaged in beating a hasty retreat from any foreign contact whatsoever—external or internal—German or other. However, as nothing so stimulates the curiosity of a child as a categorical "Thou shalt not," these laws may yet be the means of making a race of linguists out of young America.

A YEAR or so ago women internes were first received at Harvard's Peter Bent Brigham Hospital. This was Harvard's first public tribute to women physicians. The Harvard Medical School has now honored itself and the profession by appointing Dr. Alice Hamilton of Chicago as assistant professor of industrial medicine. Dr. Hamilton thus becomes the first woman on the Harvard faculty, although Miss Alice C. Fletcher has for many years been the one woman Fellow at Harvard. If this university has seemed slow in according professional women due recognition, some other institutions have kept the same cautious pace. No organization in the world has ever inspired so many women workers as the Red Cross. Who shall number, not only the nurses and their helpers, the canteen workers, the faithful makers of surgical dressings, the skilful needlewomen, the enthusiastic knitters? But no woman represents them on the executive board of the Red Cross. And now Dr. Farrand, the new head of that great organization, has gone to France to confer with representatives of other countries on the permanent organization of international public health. Our women physicians and college workers are still helping with reconstruction in France and the other stricken countries. At home the great field of public health is being plotted by women long known to be experts. Yet this international council fails to avail itself of such experience and observation, and finds it unnecessary to invite any woman to be present.

THE Conservatoire national de musique in Paris, with which, since its foundation in 1784, nearly all great French musicians have been connected as pupils or professors, gave American music-lovers opportunities, this season, to hear its famous orchestra, under M. Messager; opportunities which were thoroughly appreciated wherever the influenza did not obliterate dates. As soloists, M. Messager brought along Alfred Cortot, the famous virtuoso and professor of advanced piano-playing at the Conservatoire, and his best pupil, Magdeleine Brard, a girl of only fifteen years, who looks younger than that. She played frequently on tour, but in New York she was not heard with the Conservatoire orchestra, but at a Metropolitan Sunday concert and at a recital in Aeolian Hall, at which she more than justified the choice of one so young to alternate with one so famous as M. Cortot as soloist with an orchestra which taught Richard Wagner, according to his own testimony, how to understand Beethoven. Mlle. Brard won all the prizes one can win at the Conservatoire except the Prix de Rome, for composers, for which she is, of course, too young. Four years ago the eminent opera composer and critic, Alfred Bruneau, was already struck by the "profondeur de sentiment" in this girl's playing; "she has not the qualities of the infant prodigy which astonish for a while and then disappear." While her interpretations of French music are particularly racy of the soil, she seems almost equally at home in the works of the German masters. She will return for an American tour next season, and she may well prove a serious rival of the brilliant Brazilian girl-pianist, Guiomar Novaes, who was also educated at the Paris Conservatoire.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The End and the Means

ACCORDING to all the Paris dispatches, President Wilson has authorized the statement that the league of nations plan is to be an integral part of the peace treaty. If this be true, we regard it as a deliberate attempt to dragoon the Senate of the United States, and as such, a logical and fitting climax to the whole discreditable course of the Paris conference. It is the familiar trick of the "rider." The people of this country want the peace treaty signed and out of the way, the business interests being especially impatient of delay. At the same time, they are very imperfectly informed about the implications of the league covenant, and reluctant to wade through the diplomatic jargon which half-conceals its sinister purposes. Peace, too, is the immediate consideration; the matters canvassed in the covenant appear remote. If the Senate refuses to ratify a treaty of which the covenant is an integral part, it must carry a fearful burden of obloquy for obstructing peace; and this, apparently, is just what the manœuvres reported from Paris have in view. We may be quite sure, too, that every agency at the disposal of the Administration will do its utmost to manufacture and strengthen public sentiment against the opposition of the Senate; and this, again, is quite as it should be. It is quite appropriate that this measure should prevail, if it does prevail, wholly by force of false pretence, indirection, and dragooning, rather than only in part. This alliance of victorious Governments, masquerading under the pretentious lying title of a league of nations, organized for sheer economic exploitation, has nowhere in its constitution sincerity enough to make fitting one single inch of furtherance by aid of any honorable means whatsoever. It should continue and end under no other than the auspices of its beginning.

We must make it clear at the outset that we do not discuss the general idea of a league of nations. As to that, we spoke fully in our issue of March 8. We believe that a league of nations is inevitable, and that it will come automatically and spontaneously, by means which politicians do not contemplate. The removal of economic barriers and the restrictions now imposed by political governments upon industry and trade, would, we believe, at once effect the same free economic union among world states that now prevails among the United States of America; and we think that a free economic union is the only one that will have stability or permanency. What may be done by way of further political union, or closer political association, among world states, we do not know. While we are skeptical about it, we are aware that many able minds are in favor of trying it, in a belief that some good will come out of the attempt. We wish to refrain from any discouragement of this optimism; hence we must be understood as saying nothing unfavorable at this time about the general aspiration toward a league of nations. We merely wish to expose the character of the particular proposal which President Wilson brought back from France, and which he apparently intends, if he can, to compel the Senate to ratify. We do this the more freely because the very aspiration we mention, the pacific and friendly instinct of mankind, can be so easily perverted to support this proposal by reason of the fact that it bears the name of the thing aspired to. No trick of the politician is more common than this; this it was, for instance, which foisted a bogus reform of the nominating system on the people of New York State by calling it a "direct primary." This it may be, too, which will foist this alliance-contract upon the people of the United States, by calling it the "league of nations."

An equally insidious and undoubtedly more powerful appeal is made by this covenant also to the spirit of easy opportunism. Compromise is the rule of the world. Suppose it is not all one wants; still, it is something, and perhaps one should support it more or less on faith in its being a start in the right direction. But that is precisely what it is not. It has no quality or characteristic which essentially differentiates it from treaties that have hitherto bound the European states into competitive and predatory groups. The war has made the liberal spirit impatient of opportunism and compromise. If all the cost and sacrifice involved in a struggle to "make the world safe for democracy" have purchased nothing better than a rescript of old treaties, if it has not brought about the practical affirmation of a single essential democratic principle, we can not see any place for opportunism in judgment. Faith, under such circumstances, is not faith, but indolent, shirking credulity.

We have never discussed the proposed alliance-contract from the nationalist point of view, for those aspects of it are sure to be quite fully set forth by others. We agree with Mr. J. A. Hobson that "for America it would be an entangling alliance," and as such subversive of our best traditions—and indeed, as President Wilson himself admitted, subversive of certain elements of our independent sovereignty. These may be valuable or not; we think they are far too valuable to surrender. What interests us especially, however, is the kind of hands into which they are proposed to be surrendered; and here we find the terms of the covenant far from reassuring. Any proposal to surrender them into the hands of a group of gentlemen like those assembled at the Paris conference, for instance, to permit them to serve the purposes and carry out the motives which the Lloyd Georges, Clemenceaus, Orlandos, Balfours, Lansings, and Sazonovs have exhibited with unfailing regularity throughout their course of public life, appears to us absolutely inadmissible. But we are content to leave this view of the covenant to Senator Knox and his associates, knowing that they will say everything for it that can be said. We concern ourselves by preference with that special view of the covenant which may perhaps without prejudice be called the liberal view—and that without any inflated pretensions to being an organ of liberal opinion. We are simply in the very considerable number of those whom President Wilson, by keeping up his perpetual semblance of hitting the right nail on the head without ever really doing it, has bemocked and deluded; and in all we shall find to say about the league covenant, we speak only for ourselves and such of this number as agree with us.

The first half-dozen of the "fourteen points" were calculated to raise liberal hopes and stimulate liberal enthusiasm above measure. Understood for what they meant in the plain natural sense of language—and not for whatever Mr. Wilson's subsequent glosses might make them mean—they could reasonably be accepted, and by many were accepted, as a definite statement of the purposes for which the Allies were fighting—the purposes for which the United States, at least, was certainly fighting. Open diplomacy; freedom of the seas; freedom of trade; disarmament; the principle of self-determination; and the rights of small nations—such was Mr. Wilson's lofty bid for the liberal's toleration of the war. *Caesari appelasti, ad Caesarem ibis.* What we have got-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ten is a connivance hatched in impenetrable secrecy, a secrecy of which Mr. Wilson was himself among all the machinators present the most jealous; a connivance, further, which enables the carrying out of every execrable secret bargain laid down by the Allied Governments since the war began. So much for the first blandishment in Mr. Wilson's elaborate seduction of liberal opinion. If he has made good his professions with anything more substantial in respect to the other five points of promise, there is nothing in his proposed covenant to indicate the fact. Free seas, free trade, disarmament, self-determination, and the rights of small nations have now the precise status which they had before Mr. Wilson offered them his devotion; and his address of January 8, 1918, has the indelible indorsement of history as a "good-enough-Morgan."

What we have is a calm, arrogant, and ruthless formulation of a plan of world-domination by the five conquering powers, a device for causing the exploitable territories of the earth to stand and deliver without the risk and cost of war. Stripped of its verbiage and a cant that is matched perhaps only in the Act of Algeciras, this is the sheer fact of Articles xvi-xix inclusive. The Governments of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan are the league of nations; they are the executive council; they appoint the dummy directors; they pass finally on the qualifications of candidates; they are, in short, an absolute and irresponsible oligarchy. So far from recognizing freedom of the seas, freedom of trade, disarmament, or self-determination, their collusion precludes these possibilities. International commerce cannot be carried on except at their pleasure, under their jurisdiction, and, it is surely by this time superfluous to add, to their profit. Teleologically considered, we are offered an economic alliance which has as its primary object, in general, the exploitation of a propertyless dependent class the world over, and, as between nations, the exploitation of the vanquished by the victors, and of weaker nations by the stronger. It is an organization of what Mr. Frederic C. Howe calls "financial imperialism" raised to its highest possibility. It contemplates only a political peace, and that a *pax Romana*. Of economic peace it gives no hint; on the contrary, it contemplates the inauguration of unprecedented economic war.

This, then, is the ground of objection to the covenant upon which we choose to stand. We ask that the document be taken upon this ground and examined, with strict attention to the economic implications of every proposal, the possibilities of economic exploitation covered by every arrangement. Especially we urge this upon the propertyless and exploited class in all countries, for it is their chief concern. The past four years fortunately have given them some useful experience of the niceties of diplomatic language, and they now have the opportunity to turn it to most profitable account. They are, too, in a position where they may have something effective to say about the point-blank handing over of their economic destiny to persons or to groups that have hitherto shown themselves conspicuously dishonest in their administration of a similar trust; and they can say it none too soon. The nationalist interest of the document is for us all; its economic interest is peculiarly theirs. Let them consider what the six doctrines for which Mr. Wilson offered a casual and opportunist sponsorship in January, 1918, mean for them; then let them consider the proposals which he now sponsors and insists upon, and see which way their economic interest inclines them.

The Technique of Revolution

TO that large number of Americans who are seriously perturbed over the revolutionary ferment everywhere observable, we commend a thoughtful perusal of the article on North Dakota printed elsewhere in this issue. They will find the comparison of Russia and North Dakota instructive in the highest degree.

The old European civilization has passed away forever; we are watching beyond the Atlantic the birth of a new order—not in Paris, where we witness only the vain attempt of politicians to keep alive a decrepit state system by injecting into its hardened arteries the saline solution of a league of nations falsely so called. No, the new order comes to birth where the pulsing life of the peoples begins to find expression in new forms of economic and political organization which better meet the needs of human beings. It comes with travail and sometimes with bloodshed, as in Russia and Germany, but it comes—not only on the Continent, but in England; not only in England, but here in the United States, where a few short months ago reaction seemed to hold us in a vise-like grip. The transfer of power to the masses of men, with the accompanying break-up of economic privilege, is occurring before our eyes all over the world, and even if we did not see the same processes beginning here, it would be inconceivable that the United States alone should remain immune. To-day sober and competent observers the country over admit that the revolution is upon us; it is ours to ride the storm.

With their thinking faculties apparently paralyzed by fear, the holders of power in this country turn unseeing eyes upon Russia. They perceive only that social disorganization has occurred and that privilege has crumbled. They do not observe that the mighty of Russia chose to rely on forcible repression, and that while repression did not in the end suffice to maintain their privilege, it brought in its train disorganization and the machine gun as the technique of the revolution. The spectacle is terrifying, and the ordinary American beholder turns from its contemplation to bow down in gratitude before our Gregorys and Overmans and Hansons, prayerfully beseeching them to save us from the same dread fate. But in his blindness the American overlooks the fundamental fact. Privilege in Russia was outgrown, and it inevitably fell; it is outgrown here, and here, too, it is about to fall. The appeal to the little gods of force can mean only, here as it meant there, that the unavoidable fall will be accompanied by violence, bloodshed, and disorganization. The responsibility will rest with those who attempted to resist an inevitable social process with machine guns.

If our frightened captains of industry and finance will but turn their eyes from Russia to North Dakota, which they can see and understand, they will realize the possibility of another kind of revolution. Its results are no less ineluctable, but its processes are those of reason and not of force. It is for the holders of power to say which sort of revolution they prefer; other choice they have none.

North Dakota's problem is uncommonly simple. The State is made up of farmers, whose grievances, real and serious, have been due chiefly to the activities of financial and marketing interests located outside the State. In their war on land speculation, expensive credit, and unfair marketing, the farmers, balked at first by the politicians and the in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trenched business interests, quietly proceeded to take over the State Government in all its departments, with the specific purpose of making it meet their collective economic needs and restore their individual economic opportunity. The Government of North Dakota to-day is going forward with carefully considered plans for a State bank, terminal elevators, and such other utilities as experience may prove necessary or desirable. It is functioning in an economic capacity to meet economic needs. Doctrinaire critics may rail at its economic heterodoxy, and doctrinaire Socialists may acclaim a victory for their dogma; but the simple fact is that a revolution has taken place in North Dakota. We are watching a new type of government in actual operation. By comparison, the doings of the old species of politician in State and national legislatures and the schemings of diplomats and "statesmen" appear for what they are—anachronistic and irrelevant in the rare cases where they are not positively mischievous. We pass no judgment on the North Dakota policies at this time; it is too early to determine just what measure of success will attend them. We assert only that a revolution has taken place, a transformation in the character of government no less real, though vastly less dramatic, than has occurred in Russia.

In a considerable number of our States, and in the nation at large, the forces of privilege lie powerfully intrenched. They can, if they will, resist measures of economic emancipation by all the devices of law, backed by the machine gun and the military. They cannot stay the revolution, but they can scatter its course with corpses if they so desire. Let them compare North Dakota with Russia, and choose which technique they prefer. To-day the choice is still open; to-morrow it may be too late.

The Public Health Nurse

THE demand for the public health nurse is becoming widespread. Social agencies, educational and industrial groups, communities and States, recognize the value of preventive work, of authoritative instruction in public hygiene, and of trained inspection, in addition to the more familiar services of the visiting nurse in town and country, the maternity nurse skilled in pre-natal care, the school and welfare nurse, and the tuberculosis expert. While the need for actual bedside nursing is often acute, as in the recent epidemic, the educational work of the modern nurse is no less urgent. But if the nurse is to be community mother as well as healer of the sick, she must be given a better foundation on which to build. No profession demands a wider knowledge of the actual conditions of life, social, economic, hygienic, and psychologic, than that of the public health nurse. The present lack of proper training schools hinders the whole public health movement.

The average training school is still the old-fashioned appendage to the hospital. The probationer's days and nights are filled with repeated tasks of wholesale proportions, valueless in great part to her education. Her inexperience is brought suddenly into deep waters; her zeal is hardened into military efficiency. Small wonder that this form of training school has been called "the last of the sweated trades." The probationer is "sweated" because the hospital trustees are accustomed to think of her as an agreeable and inexpensive means of fulfilling the hospital's duty to the patients. The nurse's actual education has had slight consideration. Theoretical instruction is often crowded into an overworked programme. While it is absolutely essential that the bedside work be apportioned with the purpose of giving her familiarity with the symptoms observed, and facility in service, she should also have a good grounding in the theory and practice of health, sanitation, and hygiene; wide reading in modern economics, sociology, civics, pedagogy and psychology; and perhaps familiarity with modern languages. The pupil should be well grounded in her classwork and familiar by observation before undertaking the practical work of hospital, clinic, and home-visiting. Personally conducted study of social agencies should put newly acquired knowledge to the test.

A beginning in the right direction has already been made. Three universities—Syracuse, Washington, and California—offer a graduate course that may be taken after the regular nurse's training, and several colleges offer summer courses to the graduate. But the young woman who has spent three years in hospital often cannot afford a further expenditure of time and money.

Demobilization is turning many nurses toward the field of public health. With their recent overseas experience and broadened social outlook it is natural that they should find this opportunity compelling. They find on their homecoming that institutional positions are already filled with more recent graduates; that private patients have patriotically learned to utilize the visiting nurse without absorbing the resident nurse. But the community call is loud and falls on willing ears. Here again, however, the question is, how may they be adjusted to this larger life? Nurse and community must both be protected from the dangers of inexperience. The nurse just released from the military hospital has scant savings, and there are no endowed scholarships.

The profession of nurse is popularly accorded high praises, but these have seldom borne fruit. Hospitals receive bequests from those interested in furthering the public health; but the nursing profession is never reached by these bequests. Only ten per cent. of disease comes to the hospital; the remaining ninety per cent. must be treated in the home. And practically all preventive and educational work must be done outside the hospital. Yet in all the history of nursing only two gifts of any consequence have been made for the education of nurses: the $200,000 with which Florence Nightingale endowed St. Thomas's Training School for Nurses, and the $150,000 given by Helen Hartley Jenkins for the course in nursing at Teachers College.

What can be done to meet the present need? Scholarships should be provided for those now eager to take graduate courses; and suitable training schools should be established by private beneficence or the existing foundations. The Red Cross has already made a beginning in providing scholarships for the nurses now released from military duty. An appropriation has been made for a survey preliminary to a reorganization of the education of the public health nurse. These are valuable steps in the right direction. Of their goal, so eminent an authority as Prof. C. E. A. Winslow says: "The first adequately endowed school of nursing can do for this vitally essential profession what the Massachusetts Institute of Technology did for engineering and what Johns Hopkins did for medicine." There is undoubtedly a famine of public health nurses in the land. The demobilization of nurses should be utilized to give to these women, who have so notably proved their value in war, an opportunity to show their growing value in times of peace.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The War Labor Board

UNLESS President Wilson calls together a conference of employers and employees to rebuild the War Labor Board and to increase its scope, the most valuable economic contribution of his Administration will be lost to the future. The Board is now practically impotent. The public cares little about it, employers have lost respect for its principles, and the workers are impatient for unattainable results. The Board itself is no longer the harmonious instrument of the days when Mr. Taft and Mr. Walsh were joint chairmen.

One reason for the Board's decline is to be found in its almost surreptitious beginning. Mr. Walsh and Mr. Taft saw the necessity of production, and the truth that it could be maintained only by the establishment of justice in industry. They drew up a bill of rights, planned a representative body of employers and employees, and asked the President to sanction it by proclamation. Mr. Taft's personal influence won over enough capitalists to ensure success, and Mr. Walsh attained the coöperation of the unions. The manufacturers, it develops, did not understand the significance of what they were doing, and now that the way has been shown toward industrial democracy, many interests are anxious to have the Board wrecked and forgotten. Their enmity has in a marked degree influenced employer members on the Board, and imperilled its usefulness as now constituted. If the public understood, enough pressure could be exerted to replace the obstructionists with men of larger vision. But the quiet way in which the Board was set up did not stir popular imagination. There was hardly a comment on the sudden recognition of the eight-hour day, the living wage, and the right of collective bargaining.

The possibilities of the Board are pleasant to contemplate. It already stands on a higher plane than arbitration; it is the interpreter and administrator of principles, rather than a seeker after acceptable compromises. During the war it centred all its strength in a few typical and far-reaching decisions, as at Bridgeport and Bethlehem. Now it can apply these principles throughout American industry. To do this would require the setting up of a subsidiary board for each large industry, so that intricate trade questions might receive expert consideration—a proceeding which would obviate the existing mistake of proposing technical decisions to men untrained to consider them. These subordinate boards should be composed of representatives of employers and employees, and should function precisely as the central board does. They should not displace in any way the associations of manufacturers or the unions, or abrogate any of the privileges of bargaining. On the contrary, they should encourage and safeguard unhampered organization, and should be called upon only when differences cannot be settled directly. The rulings of subordinate boards should be final on questions of fact, and the national board, after appeal, should pass on questions of principle. In this broad way the just conduct of industry would be a responsibility resting jointly on employers and employees, first, in each trade through equal representation, and then in the national board, which would become a creative power in framing new principles and policies.

The question arises whether this kind of body should be set up by Congress, and whether power to enforce awards should be vested in it. In Great Britain, the rulings of the so-called trade boards, which are authorized to set minimum wages, are binding under the law. But in establishing the new Industrial Councils, as evolved by the Whitley Commission, the voluntary system has been followed and heartily defended. During the war the decisions of the War Labor Board were usually accepted without hesitation, as the momentum of patriotism was too great in most instances for the individual manufacturer to oppose, and the Administration was quick, as in the Smith & Wesson case, to bully recalcitrants. Such bureaucratic policing could be effective or excusable only in a war emergency; now that the emergency has passed the Administration has no effective threats, and the pressure of patriotism is gone.

We do not favor a system of labor courts that is in any way part of the legal structure of the country. Good faith and good will are the primary requisites of their success, and the slightest tendency toward compelling either faction to obey a decision felt to be wrong would arouse anger, and lead to bitterness and rebellion. No human devising short of Utopia can legislate fluctuations wholly out of industry; and strikes should not be made unlawful until better means than collective bargaining have been found to protect the workers' standard of life. The aim must be to increase continually the effectiveness of industry by encouraging coöperation between the two groups that dominate it. A voluntary court system will not always maintain peace; but with the intelligent support of the majority, it will succeed better than any other plan yet considered.

The long struggle of labor for the right of organization, a decent living, and a shorter day was singularly victorious in every belligerent country during the war. With us the acknowledgment came quietly—too quietly, for there are employers, as in New England and Southern California, who have yet to hear the news. Labor in America had a shorter season than in Europe to accustom capital to its new consciousness and convictions, but it has extended its organization into countless factories that had been closed to union members. There probably will be a determined effort on the part of reactionaries to challenge the actuality of the new power, but the President's proclamation of certain incontestable principles of industrial relations has become part of the life of the nation, and those who are so blind as to deprecate those principles will only increase labor's insistence that they be made irrevocable at any cost.

In reconstructing the War Labor Board it would be a mistake to miss the significance of the movement, as was done when the Board was originated. An extension of collective bargaining into all important industries will lead ultimately to industrial councils, as in England, and therefore to a far greater responsibility in management by the workpeople. The Board itself would not institute such councils, nor instigate unionization. But in protecting the right to union affiliation, and in setting up shop committees, it would inevitably encourage the evolution to a democracy by trades. The public needs instruction in the new theories and practices.

It will require no low measure of the modern spirit for American manufacturers to view such a proposal candidly and without fear. There are other possibilities—to insist on treating, by the old opportunist methods, with an immensely strengthened and heartened group of workers, or to close the factories and fight it out.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

North Dakota's Experiment

Bismarck, N. D., February 21

I ENTERED the country of the Nonpartisan League with some misgivings. I was acquainted with the literature of the League, and had listened attentively to the arguments of one or two Nonpartisan leaders who on occasion had addressed small groups of sympathizers in the East; but the official literature of political or social propaganda is at best an uncertain reliance, and the political agent is likely to be a past master of making the worse appear the better part. On the other hand, newspaper attacks upon the League, while often violent and abusive, occasionally bore the names of persons who, in other relations of life, were reported to be honorable and intelligent observers; presumably, therefore, the criticisms contained a measure of truth. Moreover, I had seen the rise and fall of Populism, and knew, as everyone knows, how a movement which embodies a protest against real grievances may go down to defeat by reason of the extravagance of its demands and its easy surrender to foolish, incompetent, or self-seeking leaders. On the face of things this much seemed clear: either North Dakota, completely in the control of the Nonpartisan League, was headed straight for destruction, or else it was the one State in the Union in which the millennium had actually begun to arrive. Nothing that I had read nor heard suggested the possibility of a middle ground. Even the hotels at Bismarck, as I presently learned, were pro-League or anti-League, and the traveller could not escape "atmosphere" even if he would.

It needed little observation to convince me that the members of the Nonpartisan League who, as a result of the election last November, control all the State administrative offices, all but one of the seats on the Supreme Court bench, and a majority of the seats in each house of the Legislature, are neither visionary theorists nor wild-eyed radicals. Anyone who imagines that they are such is either hopelessly prejudiced or grossly misinformed. I have seldom observed a State Legislature whose controlling majority was so obviously sensible, moderate, and intelligent. The extremist of every type, the voluble expounder of radical notions, or the reformer with his one all-sufficient remedy for social ills, was conspicuously absent. The proceedings of the Senate and House were conducted with the usual formalities, and the remarks of members, while serious and to the point, were brief. The persistent attacks of the Opposition members, who lost no opportunity to impede or discredit the measures of the majority, did not disturb the general moderation of the sessions. Outside of the chambers there was the least possible formality—the executive officers, from the Governor down, were easily accessible, and when I asked for copies of certain bills I was shown the file rooms and invited to rummage for myself. Even the unkempt electric car in which friend and foe alike journeyed between the Capitol and the hotels made for friendliness and coöperation; for the way was long, the wind was cold, and the crowded car was a haven of official propinquity.

Whatever personal aspirations may have entered into its inception or its political development, the Nonpartisan League is distinctly the product of economic grievances. The men who have given their support to it are men who have been face to face with certain hard facts of existence, from whose oppressive grip the prevailing political and economic system appeared to offer no escape. As outlined by Governor Frazier, the situation was in substance this: Most of the farms of North Dakota are mortgaged, the amount of such mortgages aggregating more than $27,000,000. In order to pay the interest, which usually comes due in the fall, the farmers have been compelled to sell their wheat or live stock in the fall, soon after the harvest, when prices were lowest. Those who could not pay have had their mortgages foreclosed, and tenant farming has increased. As soon as the bulk of the farm products had been sold, prices rose, and with them the prices of flour, pork, ham, and beef. The prices of the things which the North Dakota farmer had to sell were determined at Minneapolis or St. Paul, at Duluth or Chicago; the grain elevators were in outside hands, and there was discrimination in railway rates. Speculation arbitrarily depressed the prices of the only products which the farmer had to sell, and as arbitrarily raised the prices of everything that he was obliged to buy; and the farmer was helpless.

In order to emancipate the farmer and give him control of his own business, it was decided to begin the elimination of the middleman. In the election of 1914, eighty-three per cent. of the vote was cast in support of a proposition for the establishment of State-owned terminal elevators; but the Legislature rejected the proposal. Then the farmers organized. In the June primary of 1916 the League polled more votes than all the other parties put together; and in the fall it elected all but one of the State officers, a large majority of the House, and eighteen out of twenty-five members of the Senate. Half of the Senators held over, however, and the Senate was able to defeat the plans of the League. The next two years were spent in perfecting and extending the organization, with the result that in November, 1918, the League swept the State.

Meantime the programme of reform had widened. Something more than State-owned grain elevators, it was perceived, was needed in order to eliminate the middleman; and the elimination of the middleman, even if that were accomplished, was only one of the steps in the large process of agrarian emancipation. The platform on which members of the League were elected last November calls for State-owned terminal elevators, flour mills, and cold storage plants, with an industrial commission to supervise their operation; a State bank with a capital of $2,000,000, in which all State funds will be deposited, and which, besides doing the usual banking business, will make first-mortgage farm loans at a low rate; a State building association empowered to erect dwellings for farmers and industrial workers, payment to be made on an amortization plan; State hail insurance, a matter of peculiar importance in the prairie States; workmen's compensation, an improved initiative and referendum, and an attack upon speculative landholding through the exemption of improvements from taxation. A series of constitutional amendments to enable the State to undertake these various public services was approved by overwhelming popular votes at the last election; the amendments have since been ratified by the Legislature; and the larger part of the legislation called for is already on the statute book.

Neither Governor Frazier nor the members of the Legislature with whom I talked appeared to be deceived as to the nature of the work they are doing. They understand perfectly well that they are putting into effect a social revolu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, and that it is none the less a revolution because it proceeds by due process of law. They admit that the present Legislature, confronted with the task of breaking much new ground, will very possibly make mistakes which will have to be corrected later; but they have framed their bills with care, scrutinized them closely in committee, and freed them, so far as possible, from obscurities and "jokers." What is more, they are also quite aware that the present programme of the League is only a beginning, and that its scope must widen as experience or opportunity points the way. They do not in the least anticipate that the establishment of one or two State-owned elevators or a successful flour-mill will solve all the agrarian ills of North Dakota, but they do believe that by the establishment of such public utilities they are opening the way to agricultural prosperity.

A study of the Nonpartisan League as it is at present functioning in the one State which it controls suggests, on the other hand, some interesting reflections. The casual observer, glancing over the roster of the Senate and House, would very likely be surprised to notice that the name of the League does not appear after any name, but that the members are listed in the customary fashion as Republicans or Democrats. The explanation, of course, is that the League is not in law a party, and can neither nominate candidates nor take part in elections. So long as the ballot law of the State remains unchanged, the League must continue to lack the legal status of a party, for the reason that the law forbids the printing upon the official ballot of a nonpartisan ticket. Instead, the League is a political organization outside of and wholly dissociated from any party or parties, yet at the same time formulating a platform, pledging to its support the candidates of any or every party who are willing to accept it, and supporting those candidates at the polls with such impartiality that the controlling majority which the League now holds in the Senate and House is in each case made up of both Republicans and Democrats. The League is an inner circle, a wheel within a wheel, a power behind the throne, ruling—and with an iron hand—through the agency of party organizations for whose political acts, as organizations, in general it disclaims responsibility and professes entire indifference.

Most of the members of the League with whom I discussed the subject seemed entirely satisfied with this arrangement, and one or two thought it quite ideal. A prominent member of the House said frankly that the League was not interested in political parties, that a member might stand one year as a Democrat and the next year as a Republican so far as the League was concerned, and that the only thing which the League cared for was the success of its principles. I doubt if such a view would be generally regarded, outside of the League itself, as sound. The present position of the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota, wielding political control and claiming credit for political success without at the same time assuming party responsibility, seems at best only a temporary device, and as a permanent arrangement quite impossible. It invites charges of secret influence, improper manipulation, and clique control, and weakens respect for party tenets and obligation. The fact that the Nonpartisan League has grievances against the Republican and Democratic parties is no sufficient reason for eschewing parties as such. It seems inevitable that the League, particularly now that it has existence in thirteen States and seems destined to become increasingly a national political force, should abandon its policy of indirection and assume the form as well as the substance of a national political party.

Even more suggestive than the future of the League as a party is the theory of the organization of society for political purposes which the League embodies. The League is exclusively an organization of farmers. No one who is not a *bona fide* farmer can be a regular member of it. That is to say, it is a class organization, and the fact that some eighty-five per cent. of the people of North Dakota are farmers does not change its essential class character. By securing the acceptance of its programme by the organized labor forces of the State, it has united in common political action two occupational groups, but without interfering with the party cleavages which existed in each group. It stands ready to coöperate with any other group of workers—bankers, lawyers, teachers, tradesmen—that may choose to organize for political action and that is willing to accept the League's programme. What North Dakota has, in other words, is the beginnings of a Soviet government, in which *bona fide* representatives of the "toiling masses" unite in the direction of affairs, but without abandoning their party differences. The fact that the Soviet idea is here applied to a commonwealth rather than to a municipality does not alter the general nature of the scheme. There has been no copying of a Russian model, of course, for the League is older than the Russian revolution: what has happened is that the farmers of the State, turning away from parties which did not serve them, have united to further the interests of their class, and, being numerically predominant, the organization controls the State.

A few days ago a prominent lawyer of Minneapolis, in an address before the National Conference of State Manufacturers' Associations at St. Louis, launched a violent attack upon the League, the burden of the charge being that the programme of the League is socialistic. In so far as the League stands for State ownership or control of an increasing list of public utilities, it is unquestionably socialistic, but beyond State Socialism of that sort its members do not appear to go. Instead of State ownership of land, the League seeks to increase the number of landholders and to enhance their profits; and there is little interest in North Dakota in the Socialist party. For the I. W. W., too, I was unable to discover either sympathy or regard, notwithstanding the fact that the farmers of North Dakota are mainly dependent for the labor needed to harvest their crops upon the unorganized, migratory workers—the fertile source of supply for the I. W. W.—who regularly move across the prairie States from south to north, and who must be dealt with if the harvest is to be gathered at all. If the employment agencies in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and other cities, mindful only of the fees which they collect, could be prevented from sending into North Dakota at harvest time five laborers for every one that is required, less would be heard of the alleged "alliance" between the I. W. W. and the Nonpartisan League.

Will the League, for the moment strongly in the ascendant, endure? It will not endure in North Dakota if its enemies can prevent it. The newspaper attacks upon the League, both within and without the State, are violent in the extreme, while the mouthings of what League members aptly call "the kept press" are often so outrageous as to suggest a deliberate purpose to falsify and deceive. The record of threats, intimidation, mob rule, and personal violence toward members of the League in Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, and other States is painful reading. The danger is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the League, prospering under persecution, may harden its heart and narrow its vision, that its revolt against exploitation may degenerate into a revolt against every form of wealth or power except its own, and that pride in its own accomplishment may blind it to the need of the education without which no community may hope to govern itself well. If the Nonpartisan League shall avoid these pitfalls, there is good reason to believe that it will go on from strength to strength. Even if it fails the fault will not be wholly its own, for the blame will have to be shared by the bankers, merchants, travelling salesmen, and editors of the Northwest who, with perverse disregard of truth and common honesty, are doing their best to destroy one of the most hopeful experiments in democratic government which the present generation has seen.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

Americanism and the Soviet

By EVANS CLARK

LITTLE attempt has been made to describe what we know of the present structure of government in Russia in language Americans can understand and in the perspective of American ideals. A great deal has been told of the revolution in the language of the revolutionists. But "Bolshevik" and "Menshevik," "proletariat" and "bourgeoisie" are not words to clarify the situation for Republicans and Democrats. They merely aggravate the irritation against the revolution set up by chronic journalistic and Congressional mis-statement.

No one can deny that the American ideal is the democratic ideal. Born of revolt against autocracy, our Declaration of Independence itself proclaimed to the world that "governments are instituted among men deriving their powers from the consent of the governed," and that "whenever any government becomes destructive of those ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it." The Constitution of the United States begins with the words "We the people . . . do ordain and establish." Chief Justice Marshall, in the famous case of McCulloch vs. Maryland, made more specific this ideal of democracy:

> The Government proceeds directly from the people; it is ordained and established in the name of the people. . . . The Government of the Union . . . is emphatically and truly a government of the people. In form and substance it emanates from them. Its powers are granted by them and are to be exercised directly on them and for their benefit. . . . It is the government of all; its powers are delegated by all; it represents all and acts for all.

The public declarations of eminent Americans from that time to the present day agree in their praise of democracy. No slogan of the war aroused more genuine response from the American public than Mr. Wilson's appeal to "make the world safe for democracy." These words strike deep into the roots of American tradition. Opponents of the Russian revolution have gained their best effect in this country by the charge that the new Russia is undemocratic. That is an argument that appeals to the American public. American political life has naturally found expression in such phrases as "the will of the people," "majority rule," and the "sovereignty of public opinion." Lincoln's "government of the people, by the people and for the people" is more than a hackneyed phrase; it is the *summum bonum* of American political ethics.

The words "dictatorship of the proletariat" cut across these sentiments with a ruthlessness that stirs to its depths the antagonism of the average American. No better illustration could be found of the ill effects of a foreign and Socialist terminology. Soviet Russia, in purpose and form at least, does not appear upon examination to be "a dictatorship," nor is it, strictly speaking, "of the proletariat." And yet this phrase, for the average American, is both a description and a damnation of the present régime in Russia. The term "dictatorship" connotes a government uncontrolled by the governed—an exercise of supreme authority without responsibility. A careful examination of the evidence at hand, however, discloses the fact that not only the form of government itself, but the officials of the Soviets are responsible at every turn to those that elected them.

One of the most characteristic features of American culture is the unusual divergence between our political ideals and our political reality. Nowhere is this more marked than in the form and structure of our national Government. Students of American politics of as divergent views as Burgess and Beard have emphasized this particularly glaring inconsistency. There is a fundamental antagonism between our democratic pretensions and the rigidity of our Constitution. The American nation is a youth, lusty and growing, but clothed in a straight-jacket. The change and expansion of our national life must in the end either bend our Constitution or break it. If the Supreme Court had not by the main force of constructive analogies stretched the Constitution far beyond the intentions of its makers the break would long since have occurred. Constrained by a Constitution written by men dead a century ago, and under the domination of courts pledged to maintain its integrity, not even the representatives of the people in Congress assembled can recast the American machinery of state. As Professor Beard has pointed out, "the extraordinary majorities required for the initiation and ratification of amendments have resulted in making it practically impossible to amend the Constitution under ordinary circumstances."

No such restrictions now bind the people of Russia. As in England, the national legislature itself is the designer and repairer of the government machine. The hand of the past does not rest, an autocracy of death, upon the institutions of the Soviet state. The All-Russian Soviet fashions the instruments of government and can re-fashion them at will to fit the circumstance of change. The Russian state, thus formed, may well be described as a pyramid of responsibility. At its base are the voters of the cities, towns, villages, and rural sections. Elected by them, and forming the next tier in the structure, are the local Soviets; representatives of the people in whose hands are centred all legislative and executive authority over the territory from which they were returned. Elected by the local Soviets, are the provincial congresses of Soviets: similar bodies with jurisdiction over wider areas. At the top of the pyramid stands the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, a body composed of delegates elected by the local and provincial Soviets,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which is, in the words of the Constitution, "the supreme power of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic." Each Soviet from the lowest to the highest acts as a general legislative and policy-determining body; but it delegates administrative and even legislative authority between sessions to an executive committee, which, in turn, assigns routine administrative matters to councils composed of the heads of the several executive departments. Each executive committee and council is at all times under the control of the body that elected it. Thus is the pyramid built. The mortar that binds the whole structure from peak to base is the power of popular control.

One of the many divergences between American democratic ideals and American political practice lies in our electoral machinery. We talk of the will of the people, but we know it is more often the will of the boss and the boss of the boss that controls our political life. The manner of election of our legislatures is in large measure responsible for this anomaly. There is no intimacy between a representative and his constituency. In his nomination, his election, and his service as a lawmaker, the American legislator has closer touch with the professional politician than with those he is supposed to represent. For years forward-looking American political scientists have realized this and have talked of the value of economic over geographical representation as the only reasonable remedy. Men's interests, they have said, are essentially economic. People are bound together more closely by their occupation than by the neighborhood in which they happen to live. It might well be that legislative bodies representing different economic interests, instead of districts arbitrarily assigned on a map, would give more adequate expression of public opinion, and would bring the legislator into more constant and intimate relations with those he represents. No definite programme has ever been worked out in America to put such a plan into effect. It has remained for Russia to take the lead in its concrete political application.

Elections in Russia are, so to speak, by the shop and not by the map. Each factory, each economic organization, in proportion to the numerical strength of the group, elects its own delegates to the Soviet. The assembly is made up of representatives, not of districts, but of economic interests. Every member of the Soviet works in the same factory or organization with those who elected him. He is known to them personally; he is in constant contact with them, and is under their continuous instructions; his sympathies are their sympathies, his loyalty is their loyalty.

Elections alone, however, even such elections as these, would leave an essential weakness in the pyramid of responsibility. Pioneers of democracy in the United States have realized this for years. Merely to elect a candidate to office, they have pointed out, does not insure his responsibility. The threat of the next election if oftentimes far less powerful than immediate political advantage. Without a continuing control a representative is, for the time being, irresponsible. For the past twenty years there has been a campaign in the United States for the recall of elected officials. From its inclusion in the Los Angeles charter of 1903 to the present day, the recall has made its way into the constitutions of two or three States, into the general laws of several more, and into the charters of almost two hundred municipalities. In one sweep the principle of the recall was, in 1917, put into effect in every governing body of Russia from Petrograd to Vladivostok. The Law of the Soviet Organization (addendum to paragraph 2) prescribes that "if a member of the Soviet deviates from the instructions of his constituents, then the constituents have the right to recall him and elect another in his place." This applies to every Soviet and every committee of every Soviet under the jurisdiction of the present Government of Russia. Leon Trotzky, for instance, as Commissar of the Army, is responsible by election and recall to the Executive Committee of the All-Russian Soviet, which is responsible to this Soviet, which, in turn, is responsible to the local Soviets, which are responsible to the voters that elected them. Beside this, Mr. Trotzky carries a double responsibility as a member of the All-Russian Soviet and of the local Soviet of his own district. Whatever else Mr. Trotzky may be, he *cannot* be called a *dictator*. Whatever else the Soviet may be, it cannot be classed as an autocracy.

The Soviet is not a dictatorship. Neither can it accurately be called "of the proletariat." The term has been torn from the lexicon of Socialist vernacular and has been used to describe what it was never meant to describe. The phrase connotes class rule, the control by one caste of the destinies of another, the tyranny of labor over capital. While it may well apply to a period of transition in the Russian revolution, it cannot correctly be used to describe the ultimate composition of the Soviet state. The accomplished society of the Soviets is a caste-less and a class-less affair. The great object of the revolution has been to eliminate entirely the present antagonism between labor and capital in the only way which to the Russian is possible: by the elimination of the party of the second part. It is of the greatest importance to note, however, that there are two ways in which this can be accomplished. The property-owner can be eliminated by the elimination either of the property or of the owner himself. Newspaper reports would lead us to suspect that the latter method is the policy of the Soviets. Such is emphatically not the case. One need have no illusions about the by-products of a revolutionary upheaval when individuals and mobs run riot, and may yet be convinced by the evidence at hand that the policy of the present Russian Government is to eliminate the property owner only by nationalizing his property.

The present Russian Government has taken over one by one the ownership of the great resources of the nation. Capital, in the sense of property, remains, but in the hands of the people through the state. In this way the private owner of capital who exploits it for his personal advantage is rapidly being eliminated from Russian society. If the Czar should not own and operate the government for his personal benefit, why should the capitalist own and operate the factory to the same end? The nobility have already been expropriated; the capitalist soon will be. When the change has been accomplished, the nobles and the capitalists will still live, but they will be workers and not owners for a living. There will remain neither "bourgeoisie" nor "proletariat"; there will be only workers in Russia. Such is the logic of the Russian revolutionist. In the phraseology of the Russian Constitution (Section 9): "The fundamental problem of the Constitution of the Russian Federated Soviet Republic involves, *in view of the present transition period* (italics mine), the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat . . . for the purpose of abolishing the exploitation of men by men" and of insuring that there shall be "neither a division into classes nor a state of autocracy."

To accomplish this purpose the owners of capital have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been excluded from the franchise. Every inhabitant of Soviet Russia, male or female, of eighteen years or over, who has "acquired the means of living through labor that is productive and useful to society" or "who has lost the capacity to work," and also "persons engaged in house-keeping," are entitled to vote and to be elected to the Soviets. "Persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain from it an increase in profits" and those "who have an income without doing any work" are definitely excluded from voting or holding office. Temporarily this means a class domination. There can be no dispute as to that. Even so, however, it is the majority that has willed it.

Were the figures available they would probably show that even with the property-owners excluded the franchise is more democratic in Russia than in England or the United States. It is probable that a larger portion of the population is entitled to vote to-day in Russia than in any other country of the world. In the first place, only a small proportion of the Russian population has ever been included in the property-owning class. Russia is and always has been an agrarian land. Its population has been composed overwhelmingly of peasants and workers. In the second place, so-called democracies like England and the United States have limitations of the franchise that Russia has not. England still frankly retains property as the basic qualification for suffrage, excludes women under thirty, men under twenty-one, and aliens. About one-half of the American States exclude women from the franchise; several require educational tests, and many also demand a poll tax; Southern States in practice exclude the Negro; and most States allow only citizens of the United States to vote, while every one disfranchises all men under twenty-one and those who have not lived a certain time in the district from which they vote. Only nine out of forty-five million persons in England voted in 1918, and only eighteen out of over a hundred million in the United States. In Soviet Russia there are no residence requirements, while all men and women over eighteen, including aliens, can vote. The lack of other limitations in Russia will probably outbalance the exclusion of the property-owners in a comparison of the proportion of the population even now entitled to vote.

Ultimately, however, age will be the only limitation upon the suffrage of Soviet Russia. Like the physician whose highest function it is to make himself unnecessary, the temporary domination of the majority continually works to eliminate itself. The property-owner is excluded, but with an ever-increasing nationalization of capital each month sees fewer and fewer in the property-owning class. The property-owners become workers and entitled to the franchise; the disfranchised rapidly approach complete absorption as the limit they will ultimately reach. Each month makes the electorate more nearly all-inclusive, more completely democratic. What has been called the "dictatorship of the proletariat" proves upon analysis to be ultimately a democracy of the unclassed.

Soviet Russia thus throws our American institutions into a novel perspective. It probes anew our ideals of self-government. The Soviet, unified, responsible, controlled by the masses at every point, and amenable to change with the times, is a penetrating commentary on our congealed constitution, our sovereign courts, our President, our Senate, and our House, only intermittently responsible and frankly designed to check and to balance the popular will, and our restricted and rather futile electorate.

Mark Twain and the "Gesta Romanorum"

By HOMER E. WOODBRIDGE

THE posthumous publication of Mark Twain's remarkable satiric romance, "The Mysterious Stranger," aroused a good deal of curiosity as to the purpose and origin of a book so different in quality from most of its author's writings. Mr. Paine's admirable biography of Mark Twain did not do very much by way of satisfying this curiosity; it merely mentioned the book, rather slightingly, as an unfinished and very uneven piece of work, existing in three versions. The recently published Letters, however, contain two or three references to the story, including one of great importance. This latter is in a letter of May 12, 1899, to Mr. Howells. It proves that Mark Twain intended to put more of himself into the book than he had put into any other, and that he thought he was succeeding. He writes:

> For several years I have been intending to stop writing for print as soon as I could afford it. At last I can afford it, and have put the pot-boiler pen away. What I have been wanting is a chance to write a book without reserves—a book which should take account of no one's feelings, and no one's prejudices, opinions, beliefs, hopes, illusions, delusions; a book which should say my say, right out of my heart, in the plainest language and without a limitation of any sort. I judged that would be an unimaginable luxury, heaven on earth.
>
> It is under way now, and it *is* a luxury! an intellectual drunk. Twice I didn't start it right; and got pretty far in, both times, before I found it out. But I am sure it is started right this time. It is in tale-form. I believe I can make it tell what I think of Man, and how he is constructed, and what a shabby, poor, ridiculous thing he is, and how mistaken he is in his estimate of his character and his place among the animals.
>
> So far I think I am succeeding. I let the madam into the secret day before yesterday, and locked the doors and read to her the opening chapters. She said:
>
> "It is perfectly horrible—and perfectly beautiful!"
>
> Within the due limits of modesty, that is what *I* think.
>
> I hope it will take me a year or two to write it, and that it will turn out to be the right vessel for all the abuse I mean to dump into it. (Letters, Vol. II, p. 681.)

At this time Mark Twain was in Vienna, and Mr. Paine thinks he nearly finished the story there. For some reason, however, he laid it aside; and we next hear of it in the letters of 1905, when the author was in Dublin, N. H. Here, says Mr. Paine, "he began an entirely new version of 'The Mysterious Stranger.'" In October Mark Twain writes that the first half of the story is done, and that he hopes to finish it the next summer. The closing chapter, according to Mr. Paine, was not found till after his death.

This is what we know of the origin of the book which the future may perhaps regard as Mark Twain's greatest work. If he had written nothing else it would have given him an assured fame. No American writer, not Hawthorne or Poe, has surpassed "The Mysterious Stranger" in imaginative intensity; in breadth and virile sweep it is beyond the range of those masters of exquisite miniature. For children it is a fascinating tale of enchantment; for older readers it is a powerful imaginative indictment of human nature, and a passionate challenge of the basic beliefs of conventional religion. As a satire it is more terrible than "Gulliver's Travels"; for Swift wrote in an almost insane hatred of men,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but Mark Twain in love and a kind of fierce and scornful pity. His own comments and those of his wife are the best criticism of the book; it does say his say, out of his heart, and it is at once beautiful and horrible.

Some months ago I pointed out in the *Nation* (Oct. 11, 1917) that as early as 1889, in a conversation with Rudyard Kipling, Mark Twain expressed essentially the same fatalistic view of life that is exemplified in his great satire. Recently I have run across a story in the "Gesta Romanorum" which offers striking parallels to the machinery and some of the incidents of "The Mysterious Stranger." It is entitled "De heremita et pastore et angelo," and is printed in pages 234-237 of Wilhelm Dick's edition of the "Gesta." The tale has made various other appearances in literature; it is told, for instance, in the Platonist Henry More's "Divine Dialogues," and in Parnell's poem, "The Hermit." Mark Twain may have read it in English in a collection called "Select Tales from the Gesta Romanorum," published in Wiley and Putnam's "Library of Choice Reading" in 1845. It concerns a holy hermit who from his hermitage saw a poor shepherd unjustly slain by his master because some sheep had been stolen while the shepherd slept. The hermit loses his faith in the justice of God and resolves to leave his hermitage, go to the city, and live like other men. But God takes pity on him and sends an angel to be his companion. The angel, meeting him, announces himself, and they proceed together. They are hospitably entertained by a soldier, whose sole delight is in his little son, three years old. At midnight the angel rises and strangles the child. From their next kindly host he steals a golden cup, his host's choicest possession. On a bridge they meet a poor wayfarer, and inquire the way to the city. As the poor man turns to point out the road, the angel seizes him from behind and hurls him into the deep river. The hermit, who has witnessed these deeds with trembling, has dared to say nothing, though he concludes that his companion is a devil. A rich man whose hospitality they crave sends them to his pigstye to spend the night; to him in the morning the angel presents the golden cup. This is too much for the hermit; he cannot contain himself, and cries: "I commend you to God; I will tarry with you no longer." But the angel undertakes to explain everything. "When you were in the hermitage, you saw the shepherd killed, and for that reason left your hermitage. That shepherd had sinned, and had done no penance, but was repentant. Therefore God in lieu of penance slew him, and his soul reigns in heaven. Then we came to the house of the soldier, and were hospitably entertained. At midnight I slew his son. Know that before the boy was born the soldier was most charitable, and whatever he gained he gave away for the love of God. But after the boy was born, he loved him so much that he labored only to leave the boy rich after his death. When I had considered this, I killed the boy and sent his soul to heaven, and now his father has been rendered good as he was before. Then I came to the bridge and drowned a man. Know that that man was at that moment in a state of grace. But if he had gone further, he would have killed a man in a state of mortal sin, and by consequence that man's soul would have been damned, and he himself would have been placed in jeopardy of his life. And so since I saw him in a state of grace, I killed him and presented his soul to God and saved the life of another. Then I took the cup by stealth from the [other] soldier. Know that before the cup was made, he was temperate and good; but after he had the cup, he was drunk every day by reason of the cup. When I had seen this, I took the cup from him, and now he is rendered sober as he was before. Then I gave that cup to the rich man who sent us to his pigstye. This is the reason. God is so just that he permits no good deed to go unrewarded, and no bad one to go unpunished. Therefore I gave him the cup for his hospitality. But after his death his soul will enter hell." This reasoning completely overwhelms the poor hermit; he falls at the angel's feet, begs for mercy, is admonished not to meddle with the judgments of God, and returns to his cell with much to think about.

Mark Twain may have borrowed from this story the central idea of his plot—the idea of an angel interfering in human affairs, in ways that from a human point of view are criminal and outrageous, to change human destinies. Only he has made his mysterious stranger a bad angel—or rather, one indifferent to human notions of good and bad, and scorning human nature for its possession of a "moral sense." His Satan, however, talks at times very much after the style of the angel of the "Gesta." Thus he interferes with the life of Frau Brandt in such a way as to cause her to be burnt at the stake. "The woman is advantaged," he says. "Die when she might, she would go to heaven. By this prompt death she gets twenty-nine years more of heaven than she is entitled to, and escapes twenty-nine years of misery here." So he causes the death of little Lisa Brandt, and of Nikolaus. "If I had not done this," he says, "Nikolaus would save Lisa; then he would catch cold from his drenching; one of your race's fantastic and desolating scarlet fevers would follow; for forty-six years he would lie in his bed a paralytic log." As to Lisa, her early death saves her "from ten years of pain and slow recovery from an accident, and then from nineteen years' pollution, shame, depravity, crime, ending with death at the hands of the executioner."

If Mark Twain took his idea from some form of the old story, the irony of his application of it must have given him a grim sort of pleasure. The innocent old monkish narrator of course meant his tale as a bulwark of faith, a justification of the mysterious ways of God. He intended to rebuke human presumption, and expound divine justice and wisdom. Mark Twain uses the fable to convey not merely scornful yet pitying satire of humanity, but contemptuous denial of God, immortality, and every traditional religious belief—man's insane dreams of the universe. "There is no God, no universe, no human race, no earthly life, no heaven, no hell." This is the final message of his angel; indeed a spirit who denies! And the narrator concludes: "He vanished, and left me appalled, for I knew, and realized, that all he had said was true."

Any belief, however grotesque, may be made impressive and persuasive if it is sincerely held and embodied in brilliant imaginative form. Fortunately, Mark Twain was not satisfied with an imaginative presentation of his philosophy of life; he undertook also to expound it in a philosophical dialogue. The reader who is depressed by the view of life so strikingly presented in "The Mysterious Stranger" should read "What Is Man?" In that bald and frigid exposition he will find the philosophy of "The Mysterious Stranger" stripped of its imaginative splendor; and its narrowness, inadequacy, and essential falseness are revealed in clear light. Mark Twain there disposes with characteristic thoroughness of his biographer's naïve notion that he was a sage; and thus enables us to rejoice in the imaginative and satiric power of "The Mysterious Stranger" without worrying about its philosophy.

CALDWELL-WALLACE COLLEGE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Land Settlements and the Soldier

By FREDERIC C. HOWE

AS long ago as 1890 the little state of Denmark entered upon a policy of agricultural reconstruction. It was much such a policy as Great Britain and Australia are proposing for absorbing the returning soldier. Agriculture, almost the only industry in Denmark, was decaying as it is in the United States. The more fertile lands of other countries were driving the Dane out of business. A great part of the country was still held in large estates which were survivals of feudal times. Nearly half of the farmers were tenants. The farmers themselves controlled the lower house of Parliament, and they began the redemption of farming by making it possible for an agricultural worker or tenant to become a farm owner, by the aid of state loans to be repaid in annual instalments prolonged over sixty years time. The purchaser had only to provide ten per cent. of the cost, and the state advanced the remainder. The applicant had to satisfy the authorities that he was possessed of some farm experience and would be likely to make good on the venture. In thirty years time $18,000,000 has been advanced out of the public treasury for this purpose and 14,000 farmers have been placed on the land. There have been no losses and very few foreclosures. As a result of this policy ninety per cent. of the farmers are now owners; emigration has practically ceased; the drift to the city has been checked; and Denmark has become the most prosperous country per capita in Europe. The farm exports alone have increased from $12,000,000 to $125,000,000 in a generation.

Danish methods have been introduced in Ireland, and as a result Ireland has become a prosperous, if not a wholly contented, country. For generations, alien landlordism was the curse of Ireland. Beginning with the Land Purchase Acts of Gladstone, large sums of money were advanced from the British treasury to aid the Irish peasants in buying their own holdings. The tenant was converted into an owner. All told, upwards of $550,000,000 has been advanced out of the British treasury to convert Ireland into a country of home-owning farmers. As a result of this policy Ireland has become very prosperous; economic conditions have improved; coöperation and education have been introduced, and agriculture in Ireland has taken on a new life.

It remained for the Australian states to add new features to the Danish and Irish methods. Australia, like the United States, suffered from wasteful disposal of her public land. Huge grants were given to the early settlers, who held it for speculation. They excluded people from its use, except on prohibitive terms. This was true in all of the colonies. Agriculture was decaying in consequence. The Australian states undertook to cure this condition by two measures. One was the taxation of land values to bring land into use, to break up large estates and cheapen land for the settlers. This had a marked effect on speculation, and released the land for use. The other measures were land-settlement acts, for the creation of farm colonies, located advantageously to markets in the various states. Prior to the war, $68,000,000 had been advanced for this purpose. The colonies were located and planned by experts in agriculture, who oversaw the bringing of the land into cultivation. The villages were planned in the same careful way. Houses were built in advance of colonization, as were barns and outbuildings. The colonist purchased a ready made farm, with such machinery and working capital as he needed, and was given a long period of time in which to make payment. Tens of thousands of contented farmers have been placed on the land by this means; farm stock has been greatly improved; production has increased; the boys and girls remain at home; education has been stimulated; and once barren districts have been converted into agricultural communities.

Australia, like Denmark, solved the marketing problem by community ownership. In Denmark, buying and selling is performed through coöperative agencies managed by the farmers themselves. In the Australian colonies dairies, slaughter-houses, cold storage plants, and warehouses have been erected by the state in connection with the colonies. This gives even the smallest farmer an assured market. If he cannot sell at once, he stores his produce in the state-owned warehouse or cold storage plant. A representative of the state looks after the warehousing, railway transportation, and even the carriage of produce to London and its sale there. Not only has this insured to the farmer a market, but it has given him a good price for his produce, and has also materially reduced the cost of living.

Prior to the war, more than $1,000,000,000 had been advanced by Great Britain, Germany, Russia, Denmark, and Australia, to aid would-be farmers to buy land. There have been practically no losses, and the results have been the same in all countries. Intensive cultivation, a sense of security, coöperation, the utilization of experts, and a reasonably contented, prosperous agriculture have been the results. Within the last twelve months the Government of Australia has advanced $100,000,000 with which to provide ready-made farms for soldier settlers. Were the United States to be as generous to its soldiers, in proportion to population, a sum of $2,000,000,000 would have to be set aside for this purpose.

At the last session of the California Legislature, $250,000 was appropriated for an initial experiment in land colonization and 6,000 acres were purchased for this purpose. The colony sites were all sold, the colony was in operation and the State was secured in its investment within ninety days after the opening of the colony. Breeds of cattle were standardized; coöperative marketing agencies were introduced, experts from the State university directed farmers in their operations. A site for a second colony has been acquired and has just been opened to entry. Prof. Elwood Mead of the University of California is responsible for this experiment. He is promoting the idea in Washington and throughout the country, as a means, not only of bringing the soldiers to the land, but of developing a new kind of rural life, free from isolation, and also from the uncertainties and failures of homesteading and reclamation settlements. Professor Mead is associated with the Department of the Interior at Washington, and a model measure has been drafted, based upon the experience of other countries, for legislation by the several States.

These projected farm colonies are not to be located on Government lands far from markets and isolated from the rest of the world. They are to be State, and possibly municipal, institutions, although Federal financial aid may be granted. The colonies will be located in Massachusetts,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York, Virginia, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Texas, and on the Pacific Coast. There should be one in every State. There will be various types of colonies for different kinds of agriculture; truck gardening, dairying, chicken farming, fruit culture, and the growing of potatoes, wheat, and other grain on a large scale. The kind of colony will depend upon the market to which it is attached, the character of the soil, and other conditions.

The colony will be planned in advance of settlement by agricultural experts, while the village, which will be in the centre of the estate, will be planned as have been the housing projects of the Department of Labor and the United States Shipping Board. The village will be the centre of the community; it will contain warehouses, stores, schools, and recreation facilities. The houses will be designed by good architects, but the buying of material and the building will be done at wholesale, in order to effect economies. The village will contain such producing and marketing agencies as dairies, possibly slaughter-houses with cold-storage plants, and means for buying and selling at wholesale. Farm tractors, motor trucks, and machinery will be owned by the community, in order to reduce the capital investment of the individual farmer. The same may be true of blooded stock for breeding purposes.

According to the plan, the farms themselves would radiate out from the village, the most distant being not more than a mile and a half to two miles from the centre. The allotments near the village would be small, from two to five acres for intensive cultivation. There would be small holdings for artisans and agricultural workers. The larger tracts would be on the outskirts. The village would contain houses and small holdings for workmen and disabled soldiers; possibly handicrafts would come into existence. The colonies would be close by cities or natural markets, and the marketing would be done by wholesale, possibly with the use of motor trucks.

One reason for the failure of agriculture is the difficulty the individual farmer has in finding a purchaser. He has to use middlemen, whose interest it is to keep down the prices paid the producer. Frequently many middlemen exist between the farmer and his ultimate market. This condition could be eliminated by community action. The same is true in buying. A community of from four hundred to a thousand persons could act as a unit. The members could buy at wholesale. Coöperation in buying and selling is one of the explanations of the wonderful success of agriculture in Denmark and Australia. Experts from the Federal Government or the State agricultural colleges would direct the colony. They would train the farmer in cultivation, breeding, dairying, and scientific methods. There would be instruction for women, while the schools would be adjusted to the needs of the community.

The individual colonists would buy a ready-made farm, including the house, out-buildings, and necessary machinery. All this would be advanced by the Government, either Federal, State, or municipal; possibly even individual land holders might develop the colony idea. The would-be farmer would be expected to take a preliminary training to prevent mistakes, and would also be required to have a limited amount of capital as a guarantee of his good faith.

In Denmark the purchaser advances ten per cent. of the cost. In California he advances one-third. He is then given a long period of time in which to pay for the balance, his annual payments including interest on the cost and a small sum that is set aside for the amortization of the investment.

In Australia, California, and Germany, the laws provide that the purchaser must cultivate his holding himself. He may not sublet it. And the holdings are of a size that can be cultivated by an unaided man. For the purpose is to secure owners, rather than tenants. Tenancy is recognized as destructive of good farming and of educational and agricultural ambitions as well. Several kinds of tenure have been suggested that will insure occupying ownership by the cultivator. One contemplates ownership with a restriction on alienation; another proposal is for stock corporations, such as have been worked out in connection with the garden villages of England, and the third contemplates retention of the naked title by the Government, subject to an annual land rental by the occupier, based upon the value of his holding. The object of these reservations on freehold ownership is to prevent speculation and tenancy, and reserve to the community itself the increasing value of the land, which can be used for the payment of taxes, the promotion of education, and other community purposes.

In some form the farm-colony idea seems destined to do for agriculture what the garden-suburb plan has done for housing in Great Britain. It is the application of intelligence and wholesale methods to farming. Its authors seek to understand the conditions which make agriculture unattractive and by state action to prevent those conditions from arising. The colony is a recognition of the need for industrial or community organization in the production of food, and for the adaptation of industrial methods to farming. It suggests a means for ending the isolation at the farm and for satisfying the desire of the returning soldier for an out-of-door life and for companionship as well.

Foreign Correspondence

I. The Temper of Ireland

Belfast, February 3

THREE things differentiate the Irish situation from that in Great Britain: first, the tendency towards unity among Irish laborers; second, the Irish having now become almost unanimous nationalists, and strikes therefore assuming a semi-political character; third, British governmental methods, which prove so successful in Glasgow or six thousand miles away from Glasgow, in Uganda, but break down completely in this neighboring island. Belfast, for instance, illustrates within itself all the tendencies now causing Ireland to seethe and boil. It was tied up by the strike—electricity, gas, and trolleys—as tight as a New England temperance town on Sunday. We read by candlelight, ate by candlelight and walked through streets impenetrably gloomy but with cheerful laughter-jets spurting up most unexpectedly all around us. Glasgow had been as unhappy and pessimistic as though the war had been lost —with the strength of the British empire focussed on a loyal town, tanks, machine guns, and ten thousand troopers marching through the striker-lined streets.

But Belfast does not fear a row with the military. The Belfasters have been trained by countless political shindigs to enjoy the interchange of sticks and brickbats. Hence the Belfasters almost regret the fact that Britain does not actually pour in the soldiery and mount machine guns at either end of Donegal Street.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It appears, however, that even Ulster is breaking up. The last elections showed that if certain Ulster districts had not been contested by both Nationalists and Sinn Feiners the Carson candidates in these districts would have been badly beaten. Even the Protestant Ulsterites are drifting away from their old hatred and fear of the South and of Home Rule. The present strike, indeed, is giving labor a decided push in the direction of Sinn Fein. The laboring men I have talked with—some of the orange faith and some of the green—are quite agreed that the political issue between North and South has been thrust aside, giving place to the struggle against the common enemy, the employer. "Ten years," said one of them, "will see us all Sinn Fein."

Thus far I have referred only to the Belfast strikers, who all belonged to unions with English connections although themselves independent financially. This independence gave the Belfast men an advantage over those of Glasgow, most of whose funds were held in London and who could not, therefore, get strike pay. But the Union of Transport and General Workers in Dublin covers the rest of Ireland as completely as a full eclipse. Even in Belfast this Union has made great progress, taking up all the slack (the unorganized workers). Within a few years the U. T. G. W., a thorough-going Sinn Fein Society, has grown from 5,000 to more than 75,000 members. The whole of Ireland, outside of a diminishing Ulster majority, is of one mind, and spoiling for trouble. A strange sensation it is to see such unanimity in rebellion.

Sir Horace Plunkett, shocking though this may seem, is equally detested both by labor and by the independence people. They denounce him openly as the publicity errand boy of the British Government, and class him with T. P. O'Connor. He does not represent any real public sentiment in Ireland. Yet even Plunkett House, headquarters of the coöperative movement in Dublin, directed by George Russell, the well-known editor, appeared as Sinn Fein as any other organization. Russell is a big, burly, bearded master of paradox, who works at the coöperative movement because it is the most immediate and pressing task at hand. He is trying to educate and emancipate Ireland economically by making the masses controllers of what they buy and sell, and, more latterly, of what they manufacture as well. Mr. Russell has the small farmers with him already. In many rural industries, especially of course in the dairy business, the pyramid of middlemen has been entirely eliminated. But all this coöperative work is apparently, like every other Irish activity, only a prelude to the better day when Ireland would have Home Rule or something better. The whole island seethes with sedition.

When De Valera escaped, all of Ireland rocked with laughter, said the Irish: "The English jail is not built that could hold an Irishman who wanted to get out." Orange and Green were equally tickled at this vindication of Gaelic brains over Saxon stupidity. Yet nearly seventy members of Parliament stay in jail without legal justification. The Government in its treatment of the Sinn Fein prisoners pursued its customary policy of loud and soft pedal, alternating cruelty with leniency. For some days it kept some of its victims manacled, without freedom to look after themselves in any way. Manacled, filthy beyond description, half dead, they were, however, taken to Communion by the merciful Government.

Meanwhile the Sinn Fein programme still remains in the air. The Parliament was most impressive and served its mission as a great publicity medium. But what now? All Irishmen look to President Wilson's help at the peace conference. They may perhaps be pardoned for not understanding why the doctrine of self-determination should not be applied to them as well as to the Kutzo-Vlachs, the Dodecanese, the Letts, and the Kamchatkese.

HENRY G. ALSBERG

II. The Dail Eirann

Dublin, January 21
[Delayed in the mail]

THE men I saw gathered yesterday at the Mansion House are going to make or break Ireland. My Ulster friend says they have prepared a gigantic hoax; my ruddy Irish Unionist from Kilkenny says they have prepared a tragedy. The men in Liberty Hall, the headquarters of the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union (which in the last two years has grown from 5,000 members to 75,000) say that a Workers' Republic is on the way. Whatever the outcome, fifty puzzled journalists have gathered to rescue Ireland from the darkness of neglect. There were French and Australian and Canadian correspondents and a Fleming who felt among friends. An old Irish woman huddled over the notebook in which she set down painstaking impressions for an Irish farm weekly.

The Round Room of the Dublin Mansion House, built hastily a hundred years ago for a gala reception to a British Prince, was full of repressed emotion. Twice the crowd cheered; once when two American Naval officers came into the hall, and when the Sinn Fein members filed in to their seats, leaving the shabby rose-colored front benches vacant for their fellow-members now in English prisons. But Father O'Flannagan begged for silence, and the afternoon wore on with a quiet that was almost sadness. Even the London *Times* said this morning: "The proceedings throughout were orderly and dignified, not a word being uttered that could provoke discord or ill feeling."

Irish Volunteers with white arm-bands, serving as ushers and sergeants, stood tense as bridegrooms. The Declaration of Independence was first read in Irish—"The language of many of your Washington's generals," whispered an ardent soul behind me. Hundreds of Irish onlookers wearing Sinn Fein colors understood no more than I, but the melody of the national language served its purpose. Later the Declaration was read in French, and for the third reading Alderman Tom Kelly pronounced it in English—with a Dublin brogue. The Message to the Free Nations and the Petition to the Peace Conference was also thrice read.

I watched the members file out, a thoughtful crowd: young men from the country, plain men in the middle years, babies brought by mothers mindful of this day's historical value, old Count Plunkett who talks of "my movement," Sean McNeill, sharp and grim, who served in prison after the Rising. None of the official leaders were there, though there had been rumors that the prisoners were to be let out.

"Fools," said the observer beside me. "What good is a revolution without an army? What good is an Island without a navy? What good is a Dail Eirann without taxes?" But Father Flannagan spoke truly: "The body of the peace conference may be in Paris, but the spirit is here, where self-determination of peoples has been a holy principle for seven hundred years."

E. E.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III. British Opinion and the Conference

London, February 26

THE British public hardly knows yet what to make of the Paris conference. Things are turning out rather differently from what the electorate was led to expect when the Government appealed for its support at the polls. Lloyd George gained his overwhelming majority on the understanding that he would promptly finish off the war by concluding a peace in which there would be "no nonsense." The first thing to do would be to settle matters decisively with Germany. The ex-Kaiser and his principal agents in the campaign of ruthlessness would be severely punished; the enemy's army and navy would be dealt with so drastically as to destroy forever any possibility of the revival of militarist ambitions; the captured colonies would be distributed among the victors; and the Allies would extract from Germany, to the uttermost farthing, the whole of the costs they had incurred in the prosecution of the war.

Such was the programme. More than two months later, the prospect of its fulfilment is distinctly receding, and those who expected that the representatives of the Allies at Paris would dance a hornpipe on the prostrate foe are becoming impatient. They complain that the "fruits of victory" are not being gathered. The men whom they returned to power in order to carry out a resolute and thorough-going policy appear to have swerved from their purpose. The urgent practical business of the conference has been neglected, while precious days and weeks have been spent in elaborating utopian schemes of a type that a few months ago appealed to none but pacifists and faddists. If Lord Lansdowne and Philip Snowden had been sent to Paris instead of Lloyd George and Bonar Law, would the result have been very different from that which is now reported?

The explanation of this disappointment is, of course, that the attractive programme of the election period was hopelessly lacking in realism. It was utterly out of touch with the actual situation. The ideal that inspired it was incapable of being fulfilled in a Europe exhausted and beggared by so ruinous a four years' struggle. The members of the Paris conference have been confronted with problems that could not be solved by repeating the glowing perorations of election speeches. Hard facts have knocked all these fancy pictures on the head. It is significant that even the most intransigent section of the press is preparing its readers for still further disillusionment. Take, for instance, the question of indemnities. The popular belief that there would be no difficulty in making Germany pay the whole cost of the war has strengthened the demands for higher wages and for a large outlay of public money on housing reform and other improvements. The country, people say, can easily afford all this, because we are going to be recouped by Germany for all that we have spent on the war. But now we have such a man as J. L. Garvin—hitherto a very whirling dervish of reaction—denouncing, in the *Observer*, the "deluded maniacs who shriek for super-indemnities," and protesting against the attempt "to imitate the German precedent of 1871, which has proved accursed before our eyes."

Meanwhile, British liberals also—and I am not using the term here in any party sense—are a little bewildered by what has happened at Paris. They have still considerable ground for anxiety. They are keenly dissatisfied by the successive stiffenings of the armistice, and by the tendency to overlook the fact that acceptance of the fourteen points was a specific part of the agreement under which Germany ceased hostilities last November. They are troubled about the continuance of the blockade, postponing, as it does, Germany's opportunity of the industrial recuperation which they regard as an essential condition of her obtaining a settled government. They look with uneasiness upon the troubled situation in Poland and Dalmatia. They think it high time that a well-considered and definite policy was substituted for the spasmodic and inconsistent plunges into the unknown that have hitherto been the best method that the Allies have been able to devise for solving the problem of Russia.

The decision to place the constitution of a league of nations in the very forefront of the conference agenda has been most welcome to British liberals, who have maintained all along that this must be not a mere addendum to a satisfactory peace treaty but the very foundation of it. This does not mean that they accept as adequate the draft scheme that has been presented to the world. Its more pronounced critics discern in it dangerous relics of the old balance-of-power philosophy and too little response to the new currents of democracy and internationalism. Very general objection is made to the dominating influence of the Big Five, to the exclusion of neutral and enemy states, and to the conditions of their future admission, which will allow one-third of Europe to keep out the remaining two-thirds. What is proposed, say the critics, is not a league of peoples, but a league of Governments; the suggestion made by the Berne conference that representatives should be selected by Parliaments would have been a far preferable arrangement. The scheme, again, is described as "hardly more than a hollow shell" in all that concerns the urgent regulation of the world's economic problems. While, too, the provision for the mandatory administration of tropical colonies is recognized as an immense improvement on an imperialistic policy of "spoils for the victors," complaint is made of the omission of any clause to protect natives in dependencies which are already controlled by the present members of the league.

These are obvious defects, due no doubt to the conflict of opposing interests in which the scheme was wrought out. There is at least a possibility that the revision to which the covenant will be submitted in later sessions of the conference may amend it to make the scheme more acceptable. The criticism of it as a league of governments instead of a league of peoples suggests the direction in which the friends of democracy and freedom should bend their energies. If a league of Governments is not equivalent to a league of peoples, whose fault is that? Why should it be assumed that a Parliament represents a nation and that a Government does not? In a true democracy, the one would not be more responsive to the popular will than the other. In the same way, one hears it said that the proposals for settling returned soldiers on the land are certain to fail because they place too much authority in the hands of the County Councils, and the County Councils are under the thumb of the landowners. If so, surely the true remedy is to make these councils in reality what they are already supposed to be, namely, bodies that represent the entire electorate of the county. And if a league of Governments is in danger of becoming a league of autocracies, this peril may best be averted by each nation placing in office only such men as it can fully trust to speak in its name.

HERBERT W. HORWILL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia*

By WITTER BYNNER

He shall be our brother and be our friend,
And hunger and woe and war shall end!

The word, the word, of heart, of mouth,
East and west and north and south,
Sharp on the mountains, rolling on the rivers,
Wide on the steppes the white word quivers,
Leaping, laughing, singing, humming:
Christ is coming, Christ is coming!

Make ready your houses, make ready your doors,
Yours, Mother Mary, and, Peter, yours!
Martha, Joseph, Judas, awake—
Christ is coming, for your sake!
Christ is coming through the land
With white lilies in his hand,
Lilies of plenty, lilies of peace,
Coming to see that grief shall cease.
He shall touch with his lilies every head,
Giving love, giving bread.
And he shall be our little Czar
With angels trumpeting his car,
And he shall speak—and no more sin!
And the Kingdom of Heaven shall begin.

But who is this with a savage face?
Who has come, in Jesus' place,
With a voice not saying words to bless
But crying in the wilderness?

John, John, John, John,
Preparing the way for the Lord!
He has put his hairy raiment on
And he drinks from a bitter gourd.
He faces the Herods, he frightens them dumb—
John, John, John has come.

And a million innocent, a million wise
Wait for the star and watch it rise. . . .

O slay our first-born, men of the west,
You shall not slay at Mary's breast!
Send your soldiers, send your might,
You shall not find him in the night!
And yet the Russian shepherds know,
And the Russian wise men in the snow,
That John is prophesying true
And Christ shall come—in spite of you!

*Suggested by "The Rumor in Russia," by Christian, which appeared in the *Nation* of December 21, 1918.

Contributors to this Issue

EVANS CLARK is director of the Research Bureau of the Socialist aldermanic delegation of the City of New York.

HOMER E. WOODBRIDGE, an old contributor to the *Nation*, is at present Visiting Professor of English at the University of Illinois.

FREDERIC C. HOWE is commissioner of immigration of the Port of New York.

In the Driftway

THE post-office clerk handed the letter back for further address. "Never heard of 'Chosen,'" he said. "They probably called it Korea when you went to school," said the Drifter, "but that's all the name the country has now, unless you put it in English—the 'Land of the Morning Calm.'" The post-office clerk eyed the Drifter askance, as if he suspected him of being pro-Something, and the Drifter sauntered away, reflecting on Morning Calm and wondering if it were the calm before the storm. He remembered the high-bred intelligence of hundreds of those Korean faces, dignified even under their ludicious toy hats of black horse hair. A group of such white-clad, middle-aged men, heaving on the ropes of a primitive pile-driver, is indelibly etched on the Drifter's mind. They might have been so many college professors; they were, as a matter of fact, aristocrats brought low in the downfall of the court, and reduced to earning a living. "Is there nothing for that poetic soul with the amber buttons but unskilled labor?" the Drifter asked his companion. "He was never trained to anything; in three thousand years none of his family has had to earn a living."

* * * * *

THERE is a friendly custom in the Korean country-side which may have political value to-day. Instead of breaking his back in solitary labor in his own plot, like the Chinese farmer, the Korean works as one of a neighborly group, tilling first A's field, then B's, then his own. Early morning sees a flag floating on the favored man's barley field, and thither the workers flock for the day, kneeling in long rows to their weeding, while their huge hats, like three-foot hayracks, mount guard along the dyke. What do they talk of, as they wield their clumsy little hand hoes? What other fellowship may they be planning? Will the flag whose accustomed beckoning they answer so readily call them into wider fields? The Drifter wonders. Then he remembers the relief it was to step off the Chinese Eastern to the American cars of the Japanese train in Korea, and the creature comfort of a clean and safe Japanese efficiency. He remembers the fine schools, the re-forested mountains, the post-office and the public health, but still he wonders. If physical well-being comes through alien hands it is scant solace to a prisoned soul. Among those solitary green hills comes a low rumble across the calm:

Thunder in the morning
Sailors take warning.

* * * * *

"AMERICAN sailors beat up Japanese in the saloon and restaurant district of Tien-tsin." In Tien-tsin early in the war the Drifter used to see various nationalities supping at Kiessling's, ignoring one another, but honoring Kiessling—and his wares. But then came a time (did he perhaps lose his cook?) when the various nationalities living in the Concession reluctantly decided that he bore a German name, and the door was closed. The Drifter grieves to think of Tien-tsin without Kiessling. And if a score of thirsty American sailors, with expectations roused by tales of old-time joys, found Tien-tsin and no Kiessling, something would have to suffer. But why the Japanese? A reminiscent flavor is wafted across the Drifter's questionings. Very well—the Japanese should not flavor their ice-cream with peppermint and green tea.

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Timely Classics

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Some of the questions before the peace conference are far from new. During Pericles's time a decree was passed inviting the Greeks of Europe and Asia to come to Athens to discuss the "freedom of the seas." Plutarch, Pericles 17, says, " . . . καὶ τῆς θαλάττης ὅπως πλέωσι πάντες ἀδεῶς . . . " By "all" were meant the Greeks alone, for it was long afterward that the Greeks dishonored themselves by parleying with the barbarians.

Andocides makes a similar remark in the oration ascribed to him "Concerning the peace with the Lacedæmonians." We read that a part of the understanding was to permit the vanquished the "freedom of the seas." His words are: "· · · τὴν θάλατταν κοινὴν ἐῶντες τοῖς ἠττημένοις."

About the limitation of trade Thucydides has this to say, (iv 118): ". . . . Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ τοὺς Συμμάχους πλεῖν μὴ μακρᾷ νηΐ, ἄλλῳ δὲ κωπήρει πλοίῳ, ἐς πεντακόσια τάλαντα ἄγοντι μέτρα." "The Lacedæmonians and their allies are not to sail in a warship (i. e., along the coasts) nor in a freighter of more than twelve tons." This is part of the terms now under consideration. Indeed, one who recalls Greek history may often lay aside his daily paper because its information is so much belated.

CHARLES M. MOSS

University of Illinois, February 5

A Matter of Education

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Is it surprising that Bolshevists and Socialists resort to force in the hope of attaining their rights? Is it surprising that the methods used by the nations during these years of world war, should now be used by people who wish to secure their own freedom? The seed has now taken root in the classes of human beings most numerous and most in need of civilization, if civilization is what it claims to be. Universal education begins to show its fruit. People cannot be permanently both educated and down-trodden.

ELI YATES

Washington, D. C., February 10

What Do Our Senators Read?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Recent performances by our august Federal Senators prompt one to ask, What do these statesmen and legislators read? The impression one receives is that they are what Mr. Taft calls "headline readers." Since we have the Sage and Carnegie Foundations that conduct important social surveys, I would suggest that an inquiry into the reading of our Senators would be most useful at this time. Are they unaware that there are some good progressive weeklies in the country? Are they unaware that there is a formidable radical-liberal movement in the country and in the world at large apart from the Socialist movement they dread and do not take the trouble to understand? Would they so often and so naïvely reveal their ignorance if they were aware of these facts? Would they rush into print and into the arena with hasty notions based on headlines and yellow correspondence if they knew that thousands of thoughtful men and women habitually read progressive, liberal, or radical periodicals and had ideas of their own—ideas destined to shape the policies of the world?

We have a few able, scholarly Senators at Washington. Do these Senators take the *Nation*, the *New Republic*, the *Survey*, the *Public*, the London *Nation*, the *New Statesman*, and other periodicals of the same general class, or do they depend solely on superficial and cynical young men who write reactionary or frivolous editorials "to order" and who know as little about the matters they pretend to discuss as does the average Senator? The careful reading by the Senators of at least one progressive, sincere, well-informed weekly might revolutionize the debates in the upper chamber.

VICTOR S. YARROS

Chicago, February 19

[Of the nearly forty thousand purchasers of the *Nation*, three subscribers are members of the United States Senate.—ED.]

Sufficient Damnation

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I ask whether Galatians V. 19-21 doesn't give you all the "damnations" that anyone wants, especially with that blanket "&c.," "and such like," quite equal to cover all the way from the seventeen specified up to Browning's "twenty-nine"? You see I am an interested reader of the *Drifter* and much approved his preaching remarks.

C. F. DOLE

Jamaica Plain, Mass., March 2

An Appeal

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The roll of honor of the French *universitaires*, which naturally includes teachers in the *lycées* as well as those with university positions, is gloriously but distressingly long. Many families have been left without a head and in other cases the breadwinner is incapacitated for work. Many of the most distressing cases have already been ministered to by some of the many relief organizations already at work, and through the *Orphelinat de la guerre* American teachers are already contributing to the reconstruction of some of these families. However, it would seem peculiarly appropriate if teachers in American colleges and universities joined in an organization for the especial purpose of coming to the relief of the families of their French colleagues who have died or been crippled. All teachers who are interested are requested to communicate their views, whether favorable or not, to the undersigned.

A. COLEMAN

University of Chicago, February 10

Allied Mathematics

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: On reading Mr. Pinkham's letter in the *Nation* of March 8, it occurs to me that this fallacy of ignoring the axiom that the whole is equal to all its parts is not merely involved in some future application of the constitution, but is manifest in the very creation of the League of Nations and its covenant. The eminent diplomats at Paris seem to have assumed in the very making of the League that the whole is equal to fourteen of its parts and that a federation of the world can be made by fourteen victor nations, and its government by five self-elected parts of the whole can be arranged for by a non-amendable constitution, and still be accepted as a government by and for the whole world. They have entirely disregarded, in the creation of this document, the other hundred or two nations which, however, much they may be ignored or despised by these eminent gentlemen, are, nevertheless a part of the planet; quite a large part if one considers the combined populations of only Russia and China, for example.

Are not the fatal points in the Constitution, however—fatal to the hopes of those who have given their lives for democracy in a "war to end war"—the fact of its non-amendability, as provided by Article XXVI and emphasized recently by President Wilson; its control by five self-elected Allied nations—or any five nations undemocratically elected—and its failure to outlaw war?

S. M. QUACKENBUSH

Chicago, March 17

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

Mr. Masefield as a Playwright

The Collected Plays of John Masefield. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.75.

IN the preface to the new collected edition of his plays, Mr. Masefield speaks of his dramatic career in the past tense. "I was a playwright, according to my powers," he says, "for ten years, during which the theatre in England was the main interest of my fellows and myself." Apparently he has determined to devote his energy to other tasks; and so the time seems appropriate for an attempt to estimate his achievement as a dramatist. Any such attempt must take into account the author's purpose and his own view of his work. His preface, besides giving us information as to the dates of composition and sources of his plays, clearly implies that he regards them as a series of experiments, abruptly broken off by the war. "We did not do what we hoped to do (the war stopped that), but we had good fun in trying. . . . I hope still to see in England a theatre where playwrights will be doing easily and as a matter of course the plays we saw in our dreams."

The volume, then, is the record of a period of experimentation. This accounts for its remarkable unevenness, and for the inclusion of much that is far below the level of Mr. Masefield's best. There are nine plays in the book, of which six are in the one-act form. Of these the last, "Good Friday," is frankly a first draft, with which the author was not satisfied, and which he intended to rewrite in a quite different form. The first two, "The Campden Wonder" and "Mrs. Harrison," are obviously prentice work. They deal with parts of the same story, and neither individually nor jointly are they complete. They violate a fundamental principle of dramatic composition in that they are based upon an extraordinary act for which no motive is assigned or even suggested. In the next two plays, "The Locked Chest" and "The Sweeps of Ninety-eight," there is a marked advance in technical skill. These are good one-act story plays, in which the interest depends upon the cool quick-wittedness of the central figure, in a dangerous situation.

In the other and more important plays,—"The Tragedy of Nan," "Pompey the Great," "The Faithful," and "Philip the King,"—Mr. Masefield is feeling his way toward a new formula for tragedy. "The poetic impulse of the Renaissance," he says in the preface to "The Tragedy of Nan," "is now dead. The poetic drama, the fruit of that impulse, is now dead. Until a new poetic impulse gathers, playwrights trying for beauty must try to create new forms in which beauty and the high things of the soul may pass from the stage to the mind." He ignores the formula of naturalism, which could never satisfy a master of narrative with so fine a sense of form. In the search for new forms, Mr. Masefield wrote in "Nan" a realistic tragedy of low life, in a prose in which imagination sometimes bursts the bonds of realism; in "Pompey" a historic tragedy in realistic prose; in "The Faithful" he adapted the Elizabethan formula of the tragedy of revenge to a romantic story of old Japan, which he wrote in splendidly poetic prose; in "Philip the King" he adapted the Greek formula to the story of the defeat of the Spanish Armada, writing in rhymed verse of various metres. These experiments, each immensely interesting, had decidedly varying success. Where they fail, we believe their failure is due in large part to an error in the author's theory of tragedy. "Our playwrights," he says, "have all the powers except that power of exultation which comes from delighted brooding on excessive, terrible things." Now the exultation of great tragedy does not come from brooding on excessive, terrible things; it comes rather from contemplating the spiritual reaction of a great personality confronted by excessive, terrible things. Situation, however grim and terrible, will not give the emotion of tragedy; it is essential only because it tests as by fire and illumines a strong and noble person. "The Tragedy of Nan" just misses greatness, because it puts the emphasis upon the cruelty and horror of Nan's situation rather than upon her reaction to it. Nan struggles, it is true; but the dramatist's main interest is not in her struggle so much as in her fate. This fault of emphasis becomes much more conspicuous in "Pompey." The tragedy of Pompey is the tragedy of a great man, or it is nothing. But Mr. Masefield's Pompey is not a great man; he is only an able general, magnanimous but rather weak and colorless. The dramatist is interested mainly in explaining the circumstances which led to his defeat,—the stupidity of the Roman senate, the blind selfishness and obstinacy of his subordinates, and so forth. Here, as has been said of Mr. Galsworthy's plays, "we find victims, not heroes; and correspondingly the effect is pathetic, not tragic." So in "Philip the King," the emphasis is all on the situation; we get no clear idea of Philip's character; he is only a sensitive plate, a sort of register of emotions. Only in "The Faithful" does Mr. Masefield escape for once the bounds of his theory, and portray a great and memorable character in Kurano, his hero; a loyal follower of his dead master, in whom revenge for a cruel wrong becomes not only a master passion, but an ideal. What Corneille says of one of his tragedies is strikingly applicable to "The Faithful,"—that it owes its success to "the firmness of great hearts, which excites only admiration in the soul of the spectator," and not chiefly to pity, based on "the excess of the hero's misfortunes." This sharply differentiates it from "The Tragedy of Nan." It is worth remarking, too, that Mr. Masefield seems by his practice to agree with Corneille that tragedy "demands some passion more noble and more masculine than love, such as ambition or revenge." In none of these plays is love the central motive.

Mr. Masefield's frequent overemphasis on situation at the expense of character (or, if you prefer, on things at the expense of men) is no doubt due in part to the influence of naturalism, which loves to represent the individual as the helpless plaything of impersonal forces. In part, however, it is the result of his extraordinary narrative gift; so admirable a story-teller could scarcely do otherwise than put the story first. Sometimes, as in the messenger's speeches in "Philip the King," Mr. Masefield's superb narrative quite eclipses the immediate dramatic situation.

Of the four experiments in form, it is remarkable that the one triumphant success—"The Faithful"—should be in a variation of the Elizabethan mode. This was suggested to the author by Granville Barker's Shakespearean productions; it is constructed "for a double or platform stage." Two simple settings, one for a room in a Japanese palace and one an outer scene provided by a backdrop, serve for all the scenes of the play. Against this severely conventional background the dramatist has thrown into brilliant relief his heroic story of loyalty, pretended madness, revenge, and death. Next to "The Faithful," but by a considerable interval, we should place "The Tragedy of Nan." "Philip," the experiment with the Greek mode, in spite of its occasional lyric beauty and its narrative brilliance, is only the most recent of many proofs that the Greek formula will not adapt itself to the modern stage. It is perhaps worthy of remark that the use of rhymed verse of various types in this play strongly suggests the manner of Verhaeren, who also wrote a play on Philip II. In "Pompey" Mr. Masefield attempted a modern colloquial treatment of a historic theme such as Shaw essayed in "Cæsar and Cleopatra" and Strindberg in "Gustavus Vasa"; but these plays live by the vitality of their characters, whereas "Pompey" is almost characterless. But it is ungracious to emphasize failures in a volume which includes two excellent story plays, a profoundly moving realistic drama, and a great romantic tragedy. It is to be hoped that Mr. Masefield will reconsider his decision; the English theatre is not so rich that it can afford to lose the author of "The Tragedy of Nan" and "The Faithful."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The War's Philosophical Background

The Present Conflict of Ideals. By Ralph Barton Perry. New York: Longmans, Green & Company. $4.50.

IN an age of efficiency and popular pragmatism it is a joy to come upon a book devoted in all its 545 pages to the defence and illustration of the thesis that ideas count. Professor Perry believes not only that the war has something to do with ideas, but that it has a background which may actually be called philosophical. Not that he believes the peoples of the world are consciously quarrelling and fighting over the technicalities of idealism and naturalism, as their ancestors did over the subtleties of the homoousian-homoiousian controversy. Strictly philosophical questions have, of course, retired far into the background, but, in the author's opinion, they are at any rate actually there, influencing all sorts of present-day controversies, military, political, social, moral, and religious, far more than the fighters in the front trenches suspect. The lectures in which Professor Perry deals with this subject were first given at the University of California in the early months of 1918, at the time when the armed struggle was at its height; but they deal with a larger conflict than that which was expressing itself last spring through the mouths of cannon, and they were intended for a larger audience than his California hearers. Hence the present volume.

In an earlier work entitled "Present Philosophical Tendencies," Professor Perry attempted an exposition of the more technical epistemological and metaphysical aspects of what he deems the four regnant philosophies of the day—namely, naturalism, idealism, pragmatism, and realism. Retaining this subdivision as his guide, he has sought in the present volume to work out "the moral, emotional, political, and religious implications" of these four points of view. A certain amount of exposition of the philosophies themselves has, of course, been found necessary for the benefit of those not already acquainted with them; but this has been done briefly (and with great skill), and for both the technical philosopher and the general reader the chief interest of the book will lie in the implications educed.

By naturalism Professor Perry means "such philosophy as grows directly out of the methods or results of the physical sciences." The emotional outcome of this view is to be seen in a certain pessimism and misanthropy, a certain despair as to many of the older values of the individual and the race consequent upon the loss of various non-scientific faiths—a despair, however, which is in its turn sometimes hidden or in part overcome by a characteristic consolation to which an objective and impersonal contemplation of nature may give rise. On the active and practical side of life naturalism has, of course, had an enormous influence through its stimulation of the cult of science, and particularly in enforcing the scientific study of man, society, morality, and religion. Naturalism, in fact, is the intellectual source of Marxian Socialism, and is also, in the author's opinion, the chief influence in our age toward the growth of democracy. In its bearings on religion and the older sort of morality, on the other hand, and in general in its effect upon all spiritualistic metaphysics and upon "the belief that the mental and moral things are first in the order of reality, the influence of science has invariably been innovating and radical," not to say negative and destructive. As a consequence, champions of the more spiritualistic view have sprung to its defence, most of them arming themselves with the weapons forged for their use by idealism.

It is the author's belief that these weapons are not very well adapted to the conflict. The idealists themselves, in fact, are in sharp disagreement as to which weapons are the best for their purposes and as to how they should be used. Professor Perry describes the armament and the strategy of four separate groups of defenders of the spirit: spiritualistic agnostics, panpsychists, personal idealists, and absolute idealists. For the philosophical reader this section of the book, involving some five chapters, will be perhaps the most interesting portion of the volume, but lack of space forbids any account of the author's very acute analysis and criticism of the first three positions. The fourth position, that of the absolutists, he considers the back-bone of the whole idealist contention, but his analysis of it (in which he follows James and Dewey) results in reducing it to a position which is pragmatically not very different from that of the naturalism which it set out to refute. He agrees with Dewey, moreover, in making the idealist ethics of Kant at least logically chargeable with a considerable share in the terrible events of our times. "Kant's theory was logically of the most menacing character imaginable. It implied that a man might justify his act by its inward accord with reason, *whatever its consequences.* . . . Virtue being thus divorced from all content, from those specific precepts and sentiments which conduce to social welfare, these may readily be replaced by the commands of the State. Formalism in ethics breeds submissiveness to authority. . . . When this is done, when the moral agent imposes on himself by force of conscience whatever the State enacts, then the tyranny and unscrupulousness of the State's action is not only ignored and unchecked, but receives a powerful reinforcement from the moral motives of the community. Tyranny is called 'freedom' and unscrupulousness is called 'righteousness.' I should not thus enlarge upon the practical implications of Kantian formalism did I not believe that this logic has played an important part in the events of the day, and given in the name of Kant a moral sanction to practices which the human impulses and a considerate regard for social well-being must unqualifiedly condemn."

In Professor Perry's opinion, the philosophy of absolute idealism is the intellectual root not only of the German justification of acts which all the rest of the world consider devilish, but also of that exaggerated notion of the State, with its consequent State-worship, which did so much to bring about the international calamity of our days. In a careful argument, which it is not possible here to reproduce, he shows how the idealistic conception of organic unity, the Hegelian identification of the nation with the State and the insistence upon the State's finality and its duty of self-realization, lead consistently and inevitably to the Treitschke-Bernhardi type of political theory, which puts internationalism out of the question and makes the regular recurrence of war almost inevitable. It would be hasty to assert that Professor Perry has altogether demonstrated the truth of his position, and doubtless the absolutists will have their answer. The degree to which his argument will be found persuasive will vary according to the original bias of the reader. All that the reviewer can do is to acknowledge the possibility of an original bias on his own part, and then to register his conviction that Professor Perry's conclusion is fully justified.

Pragmatism, or, as he prefers to call it, instrumentalism, receives rather more sympathetic treatment at the author's hands than idealism. Not only James and Dewey but even H. G. Wells with his Invisible King come in for a considerable measure of approval. Bergson himself receives but little criticism, although, as readers of Professor Perry's other writings will realize, this must not be taken to imply any great amount of sympathy with the French thinker's fundamental position. Apparently Professor Perry considers the fruits of Bergsonism less objectionable than its roots.

As even pragmatism, however, with all its superiority over naturalism and idealism, is not in every respect sound, Professor Perry finally introduces us, in modest fashion, to his own philosophy—the new realism. Owing to the small following which this philosophy has yet secured, its practical influence is of course at a minimum, hence it "must evidently bide its time and content itself for the present with laying claim to the future!" Professor Perry does indeed give us a brief outline of the bearings of the new philosophy on many ethical, religious, and social questions—maintaining, among other things, the rather startling thesis that individualism, social democracy, and humanitarianism are all logically derivable from the neo-realistic doctrine of the externality of relations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps the most interesting portion of the volume for most readers is the last ten chapters, which treat of the philosophy of nationality and the characteristic traits and ideals of Germans, French, English, and Americans. But while these chapters may have the greatest popular appeal, every section of the book will repay the study and in most cases hold the attention of any one who is interested in the age we live in.

A Naturalist in the Jungle

Jungle Peace. By William Beebe. New York: Henry Holt & Company. $1.75.

IT is a great satisfaction to find a book so full of literary charm, so abounding in descriptions that remain in the memory as Mr. Beebe's "Jungle Peace," and yet at the same time a book based on the solid foundation of science—which is only another name for truth. As the author says: "If one looks the jungle straight in the face and transcribes what is seen, there is evolved technical science; and until this can be done with accuracy and discretion, one can never feel worthy, now and then, of stealing quietly up a side aisle of the great green wonderland, and, as I have done in these pages, looking obliquely at all things, observing them as actors and companions rather than as species and varieties; softening facts with quiet meditation, and leavening science with thoughts of the sheer joy of existence."

Instead of wasting his time, during the voyage to the tropics, in "the littlenesses of ship life," or in haunting the smoking room, the author watches from the "crow's nest" the birds and turtles and whales, grapples from the rail for floating patches of seawrack, and spends absorbing hours in studying the inhabitants thereof. Among the Antilles his imagination is stimulated to the highest pitch by the small and insignificant islands. "It is a curious fact that any land projecting above the surface of the water is interesting and exciting in inverse ratio to its size. . . . This love of small islands must savor of the joy of possible completeness in achievement, plus a king's sensation, plus some of those of Adam."

Arrived in British Guiana, where the author's mission was to establish a research station for the study of tropical life, it is not alone the flowers and the beasts and birds of the jungle that absorb his attention. Mankind, as manifold and varied as tropical nature itself, is constantly appearing in these pages. Mr. Beebe is a humanist as well as a naturalist. Indians of the East and Indians of the West, each with their peculiar customs, lawyers and convicts, Negroes and Syrians, are constantly appearing in these pages. In Berbice the writer discovers an obsolete library. "No volumes had been added for many years. Most of them were old, old tomes, richly bound in leather and tree calf. Nearly all were strange to me—little-known histories and charmingly naïve 'Conversations' and memoirs of generations ago."

Colonel and Mrs. Roosevelt were the first visitors welcomed to Kalacoon House, the laboratory in the jungle. "Most memorable to me," says Mr. Beebe, "were the long walks which Colonel Roosevelt and I took on the Kaburi Trail, that narrow path which is the only entrance by land to all the great hinterland lying between the Essequibo and Mazaruni Rivers. . . . Our progress was thus through a glorified tunnel; we travelled molewise with only here and there a glimpse of the sky. Every walk was filled to the brim for me with that infinitely satisfying joy, derived from frank, sympathetic communion with an enthusiastic, true friend. I know of no earthly pleasure more to be desired."

For a full week Mr. Beebe studied the bird-life of a single tree in the jungle. "Although no forest giant, with no great buttresses or masses of parasitic growths, it held up its branches and twigs in full sunlight a hundred feet or more above the ground. And its twiggy fingers were laden with a wonderful harvest of fruit, uncounted berries which attracted the birds from distant roosts and drinking places. . . . Every sense came into play. Sight, first and foremost, had been put to the most severe of tests in attempting to record the happenings against the glare of the sky high up among the foliage of this bit of jungle. I strained through my high-power glasses until, when I looked without them, the world seemed withdrawn, dwarfed as in the horrid imaginings of fever. . . . My ears strove to catch every song, every note which might prove a character of worth. The jungle scents played upon my emotions and sometimes dominated my work; the faint aroma from some invisible orchid overhead, the telltale musk from a passing mammal, the healthful scent of clean jungle mould. As for taste, I had tested the aromatic berries and fruit of my canella tree, and for science' sake had proved two warningly colored insects. My sense of feeling had operated involuntarily and wholly aside from my scientific desires. Whether stimulated by dozens of mosquitoes, scores of ants, or hundreds of *bêtes rouges* or 'muscuims,' the insistency of discomfort never discouraged a primary desire to delve as deeply as possible into the secrets of this small area of tropical jungle."

One could go on almost indefinitely quoting striking passages and interesting observations. Mr. Beebe's knowledge of his subject and his intense love of tropical nature give to the book a great charm. The "nature-lover," no matter how poetic his imagination and how delightful his literary style, who shocks the initiated by his faulty observations, his ignorant deductions, and his general lack of accuracy is to be decried. The scientist who bores the layman by his dry-as-dust descriptions and careless style is read by but a few specialists. Mr. Beebe is neither the one nor the other, for he combines scientific accuracy and knowledge with æsthetic feeling and literary charm. In his word-pictures he uses at times the fine brush of the miniature painter, at times the coarse brush of the impressionist, and occasionally he adopts the bizarre treatment of the decorative artist; but whatever his method, the result is always admirable.

A South American Classic

Amalia: A Romance of the Argentine. Translated from the Spanish of José Marmol by Mary J. Serrano. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. $2.

SEVERAL South American novels have lately been turned into English: we have seen none thus far possessing the intrinsic merit, as fiction, of José Marmol's "Amalia." It is a sign of that unintelligence which has companioned our vague brotherly "Monroe-doctrine" ardor, that while this story was translated into German and Russian many years ago, it is now for the first time made intelligible to readers of English. How little we know of the keen intellectual life of our great universities of South America, of her actual artistic achievements! "Amalia" is a romance in the best traditions of the mid-nineteenth century. It has the eloquence, the continuous clash of wits and of arms, the flowing dialogue, the dramatic incident of the age of Dumas and Hugo. It has a theme untrammelled by previous handlings, a scene of fresh and picturesque quality, and a romantic action that advances steadily to its tragic end. South American tyrannies and revolutions have oftenest been interpreted by North American romances in terms of opéra bouffe. We have seen in them the remoteness and the color beloved of the romantic spirit, but we have not "taken them seriously." One recent American novel, "El Supremo," may be cited as an exception. Its theme was not dissimilar to that of "Amalia." It had to do, that is, with a régime of tyranny existing always under the threat of revolution. Francia of Paraguay and Rosas of the Argentine alike held their sway as if by main force of will and personality. In both cases the Spanish rule had been cast off only to deliver the struggling new-born commonwealth into the hands of an unscrupulous dictator. Francia, however, is almost unchallenged as the hero of "El Supremo," the element of passonate romance, of "heart-interest," being somewhat coldly lugged in by the northern story-teller. In "Amalia," while the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presence of Rosas, his personal authority and menace, are always to be felt, the tale really centres in the group of young and ardent patriots of whom Daniel Bello, Eduardo Belgrano, and their sharply contrasted sweethearts are rather more than typical figures. For the group as a whole, though ardent, is neither firm nor highly courageous. If it had been, according to our chronicler the Argentine Republic would have been spared many years of suffering at the hands of Rosas and his subjects. For it was at this very time, some five years after Rosas established his despotic rule, primarily as Governor of Buenos Ayres but really as autocrat of the loosely-linked provinces which together made up the so-called republic, that he might most easily have been overthrown. Pure "nerve" and "bluff" on his part and pure "funk" on the part of his opponents then saved him; and a dozen years were to pass before the hour arrived of his downfall and exile, and the beginning of a true democracy in the Argentine. Daniel Bello represents the best of the Argentine character and breeding during this submerged period. He belongs to the better class in wealth and education, most of whom are openly or secretly Unionists or "Unitarians" and therefore the enemies of Rosas and his "Federalists." But in this class there are few of firm principles or resolute spirit. They cannot act together, and therefore their cause is doomed. Bello analyzes their faults unsparingly: "Believe me," he cries to his band of intimates, assembled in the name of liberty; "believe me—we have neither religion, virtue, nor knowledge; and we have nothing of civilization but its vices." Therefore at the moment when Lavalle is within striking distance of Buenos Ayres, when a determined advance from without, seconded by the uprising of even a few patriots within, might have broken the flimsy fabric of the tyrant's authority and so made instant rebels of his intimidated followers—even at this moment the collective will of the patriots is unable to assert itself against the individual will of the one strong man among them; and a very ancient comedy is reënacted.

But, as we have said, all this complex political and military activity, this feud of classes and fumbling with the idea of freedom, is interpreted through a romantic action of no mean power. Bello and his cousin Amalia stand for all that their cause possesses of courage and intellect. Not therefore are they to be mates: it is the boyish gallant, the slightly stupid Belgrano, who wins the doughty Amalia, and proud Bello's happiness lies in the hands of a dainty and purely feminine charmer. We say the doughty Amalia: so, it is clear, she seemed to her creator. This Amazon of the 'forties, with her faintings and her shrinkings, would surely look mild enough beside one of our militant damsels. But Amalia plainly does not dream that the way to be a perfect woman is to imitate or even to outdo the male. Apart from these four, whose happiness and whose lives (but for Bello's charmer) are to be thrown into the pot of sacrifice for a lost cause, there is much and varied characterization to be found in this book. There is the comic figure of Don Cándido, poltroon extraordinary; and there are the supremely feline Doña María Josefa, the sordid and lecherous villain Marino, and the hapless devoted Manuela, Rosas's daughter and victim. Not least, there is the figure of Rosas himself, dingy, domineering, subtle, aware that the secret of his power is that his countrymen shall go in fear of him night and day—not less his fellow-Federals than the "filthy dogs of Unitarians," as his enemies are officially called. He lives meanly, works incessantly, has only one pleasure—authority, and the exercise of that blend of bullying and adroitness on which his authority depends. One portrait here is not highly agreeable for "Anglo-Saxon" beholders—that of the British Minister at Buenos Ayres, who is represented as venal, fawning, drunken, and altogether pusillanimous: Rosas uses and insults him at will. The author admits that though his diplomatic methods are typical enough of British officialdom, "in respect to forgetfulness of his official position and of his dignity as a man" he is a rare bird. "As others see us"—certainly a queer foil this, for the official White Man of Kipling's vision!

Books in Brief

TENNYSON, it is said, once acknowledged the receipt of a volume of verse by an Australian poet with the words: "I have received your poems, but, unlike John the Baptist, I cannot live on locusts and wild honey." "The Oxford Book of Australasian Verse" (Oxford University Press; $3) would no doubt fall under the same condemnation if tried by the Tennysonian standard. Much of it is certainly wilderness fare. In other words, it is, for the most part, pioneer verse, full of "the wild joys of living" in a new and unsubjugated land. It is not subtle, and much of it, we suspect, is not lasting; yet it has a distinct character and charm of its own. The gorgeous beauty of the southern landscape, the strange and musical names of austral birds and flowers and trees, the magic of "the bush" are no bad substitutes for subtler graces. It is curiously unliterary verse, in spite of its obvious metrical echoes of Swinburne and Kipling. Its marked preference for long, swinging, galloping measures is, like its taste for narrative, a pioneer note. Edmund Clarence Stedman once remarked that colonials, though not a primitive folk, have a primitive tendency towards balladry, and this volume illustrates it. Many of these poets are not native to the south, but there are no sighs of the exile here. "Home" is mentioned only to be contrasted with "the land of gold and burning blue" that has become so much dearer to them. Only a few of the names are familiar to northern readers of poetry, and a little biographical information would therefore have been welcome. Several of them, and those among the best, belong to the so-called "Bulletin School," that is, their verse was first published in the contents of the Sydney *Bulletin*. Some of them have published in English periodicals. Arthur Adams is one of these, and the six poems from his hand included in this volume would be notable in any collection of modern verse. The best-known name is that of Adam Lindsay Gordon, whose stormy life and tragic death have suggested to his admirers the easy comparison with Byron. His verse is not precisely Byronic; but in its ringing melody, its manly feeling, and above all in its passionate glorification of the adventurous life of "the bush," we find, in the words of Marcus Clarke, the editor of his collected poems, "something very like the beginnings of a national school of Australian poetry." He has been called "the laureate of the Centaurs," for his career as mounted policeman, horse-breaker, livery-stable keeper, and steeplechase rider fitted him to celebrate the pioneer's chief friend, the horse, with a tenderness and understanding that few poets have equalled. "Australian literature," it has been said, "originated not in the student's library, but in the trooper's saddle." Poetry like this should appeal to robust lovers of life everywhere, and not least to the gallant boys, both English and American, who have found, in the great adventure just ended, such sympathetic comrades in their Australasian brothers-in-arms.

A STANDARD history of Spanish institutions and culture is now made available to English readers in Charles E. Chapman's "History of Spain" (Macmillan; $2.60), founded on Rafael Altamira's "Historia de España y de la Civilización Española." It is assumed that the present generation of Americans is interested in Spain chiefly as one of the powers which most successfully colonized this continent. Mr. Chapman has therefore retained those portions of his original, comprising about one-fifth of the complete work, which are of greatest interest to this type of reader. Political history has not been neglected, to be sure, but only enough of it has been retained to serve as a skeleton. The growth of Iberian civilization is the main theme. Mr. Chapman is far from a mere translator. His method is one of adaptation, condensation, and paraphrase. The result is a very readable book. Scholars will doubtless prefer to consult Altamira in the original; but Mr. Chapman serves rather the general reader, as appears from the fact that his bibliog-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

raphy mentions only works written in English. Three chapters are wholly the work of the adapter: one on the period of Charles III, and two which continue the narrative from 1808, where Altamira ended his story, down to the present. The last chapter, containing an interesting discussion of Spanish traits, refutes many common misconceptions regarding the Spaniards. One notes a tendency to maintain paradoxes—as when the author argues that Spaniards are not lazy; one is reminded by contrast of Arnold Bennett's discovery that Americans are not energetic. That portion of the book dealing with literature is the least trustworthy. Clearly, Mr. Chapman is not at home in this field, and often misrepresents Altamira's thought. We find, for example, the statement that "Epic poetry did not prosper in this era [the sixteenth century]; its function was supplied by romance." Altamira had written that the *romance* (the ballad) was the national epic form during the century referred to. Again: "Well might he [Cervantes] say that he was the first to write novels in Castilian." Cervantes never made so absurd a boast. He did assert that he was the first Spaniard to write *novelas*, meaning short artistic stories in the Italian manner. Mr. Chapman also states that Gil Vicente and Torres Naharro wrote "crude farces." Altamira said that they wrote *comedias* (plays). But these are trivial blemishes in a book as interesting as it is useful.

TO the useful "Modern Student's Library" has been added a volume of "Nineteenth Century Letters" (Scribners; 75 cents), selected and edited, with an Introduction, by Byron Johnson Rees. From so abundant a garden each one of us would be inclined to make his own anthology, differing from that gathered together by any one else; it is but natural, therefore, that we miss old favorites from among the letters of such masters of this gentle craft as Charles Lamb, Edward FitzGerald, and George Meredith. Byron exercised his craftsmanship often ungently; the tremendous energy that is the chief characteristic of his letters is better illustrated by the letter of April 6, 1819, glowing with energy and genius, in defence of "Don Juan" than by any in this collection. From the Shelley selection we miss such masterpieces as the letter of July 12, 1816, which recounts to Peacock the journey around the Lake of Geneva, and that of March 23, 1819, describing the Baths of Caracalla. The letter of December 22, 1818, on Rome, is given, but with the unaccountable omission of the most beautiful paragraph in it. But, in the main, Professor Rees has accomplished his task with notable taste and judiciousness, in accordance with the three principles set forth in his preface—that the letters chosen should be typical of the writers, that they should furnish information as to literary conditions and relationships, and that they should possess interest in themselves as examples of epistolary correspondence. It was a happy thought to bring into the brief Introduction so many remarks upon letter-writing culled from the correspondence of the men and women represented in the body of the book, so that the principles of the pleasant art are set forth by those who have exercised it best.

THE members of the English department at the University of Wisconsin have united to produce a volume of "Studies" (University of Wisconsin; $1), embodying both formal research and literary criticism, which does credit to both the breadth and the scholarly industry of the department. It is also encouraging to have evidence that such ample opportunity for the pursuit of liberal studies is afforded in a modern state university, reputed especially for the development of subjects dear to the average voter and the legislator. The collection contains fifteen papers and a sonnet, with rather fewer than usual of contributions which may be suspected of being included for courtesy's sake; and it is obvious that no unified account of them can be made, since they range from a consideration of "Unity, Coherence, and Emphasis" (in a paper wherein a Harvard man heretically renounces the sacred trinity of the department at Cambridge) to the exploration of the genealogy of Chaucer's birds in the "Parlement of Foules." Perhaps the most interesting of the studies, to readers of trained intelligence but without concern for one or another of the more minutely specialized themes, are Professor R. E. N. Dodge's account of "Theology in Paradise Lost," in which certain aspects of Milton's doctrine are made to illuminate his methods of characterization; Professor Warner Taylor's analysis of "The Prose Style of Johnson," interesting not so much, perhaps, for the immediate subject as for the writer's ingenious and widely applicable methods of scientific study of prose technique; Miss Lily Campbell's outline of the evolution of "Costuming on the English Stage between 1660 and 1823"; and Dr. O. J. Campbell's study of "Some Influences of Meredith's Philosophy on his Fiction," in which analytic and æsthetic criticism are admirably combined. Mention should also be made of an important paper by Professor William Ellery Leonard on "Beowulf and the Niebelungen Couplet," which, though on a seemingly forbidding theme, is carried through with such vivacity and penetration as to be readable for the mere amateur. Finally, it should be noted that the collection of studies is dedicated to Professor Frank G. Hubbard, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his professorship.

SEVERAL years ago Mr. Hyman Segal wrote "The Book of Pain-Struggle," which interpreted all human conduct in terms of man's reaction to pain. This reaction he called "struggle." Partly inspired by the war, Mr. Segal now returns to his favorite subject in "The Law of Struggle" (New York: Massada Publishing Company; $1.50), in the foreword of which he asserts that the whole question, "What is the blundering purpose of the world?" is "embodied in the correct understanding of pain and struggle and their true avenues of expression; the whole solution, in the frank recognition of pain as of the very stuff of life and the way in which it must normally react in struggle." And he adds grimly: "Perhaps if the subject had been given a tithe of the study devoted to armaments and tactics, the world would not to-day be peering so anxiously out of the bloody abyss in which it finds itself." In his chapter on war as a phase of struggle, Mr. Hyman observes that "to one schooled in Pain-Struggle, there is still something startling, though nothing unnatural in war. War reveals man in a more elementary attitude of struggle than is usually apparent in the complex ramifications of the struggles prevailing in peace times. . . . War is not synonymous with struggle. It is only a phase of struggle, a small phase." War may, however, he adds, attain to greatness in the scale of struggle when it becomes part of a great aspiration. "War then becomes a great manifestation of struggle, not because it is war, but because it becomes the embodiment of a great idea, full of innate religious force, transfiguring all classes and all relations." Mr. Segal's theory is interesting, and it is well and fearlessly worked out. It is, in its main aspect, akin to the principal doctrine of Freud; indeed, Mr. Segal goes beyond the Viennese professor in tracing all human activities primarily to unfulfilled wishes, while the latter contents himself with tracing to them merely the vagaries of the sick and neurotic.

FREDERIC ECCARD, an advocate before the tribunal at Strasbourg before the war, who had endeavored "to defend, against the temporary masters, the French language, culture, and mentality which constituted . . . essential elements of Alsacian civilization," is the author of a small volume entitled "L'Alsace sous la domination Allemande" (Paris: Armand Colin). The excellences of the book arise from the fact that the author is an intelligent and educated man who has lived in Alsace under German domination, and therefore knows his subject in that intimate, personal way that can never be acquired by an outsider by any amount of diligent research in documents. The defects of the book arise from the fact that the author is, as one might expect and indeed would wish him to be, a pronounced anti-German. He has suffered too much from the stupid

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prussian régime to make it possible for him to write an impartial history of that régime. He is concerned to prove a thesis—the thesis that Alsace was wholly French in 1870, that it desired to remain a part of France then, and that it has never had any other desire since. Thus in dealing with the rise of the movement for autonomy, symbolized under the popular cry of "Alsace for the Alsacians," M. Eccard says that the Alsacians sought autonomy only that "their hands might be more free for the future." Consequently, it is a grave error to think that their desire to be restored to France had diminished in intensity. It was more intense than ever—we shall furnish the proof in a moment—but, for reasons of expediency, they devoted themselves temporarily to the pursuit of more attainable ends." This may be true, but the "proof" which the author promises is not convincing; and one suspects that the motives which he attributes to the Alsacians during the movement for autonomy are only the motives which many Alsacians *now* wish had been the actual ones. On this point, Mr. Phillipson, in his excellent book on Alsace-Lorraine, reviewed in the *Nation* for March 1, reaches a quite different conclusion. M. Eccard's book, both on account of its excellences and its defects, might very well be read in connection with that of Mr. Phillipson.

IT is a severe test to subject the unbridled exuberances of after-dinner oratory delivered, it may be, under the stimulus of wine and women, if not also of song, and generously applauded and encouraged by hearers similarly stimulated, to the cool and critical judgment that one brings to the perusal of the printed page. A collection of such speeches, with a number of more formal addresses, by the late John Lewis Griffiths, American Consul-General in London at the time of his death five years ago, is offered to the reader in a volume edited by Mrs. Griffiths and entitled "The Greater Patriotism" (Lane; $1.50); and they bear the test better than might have been expected. Especially good are the carefully prepared discourses on Hawthorne (Griffiths, like Hawthorne before him, was consul for a few years at Liverpool), Lincoln, and Dr. Johnson. "The man who thinks and who is able to clothe his thoughts in appropriate and convincing language wields a compelling influence over his fellow-men." Thus said Griffiths, and he exemplified the truth of his own words. He could think clearly and express himself cogently, as well as correctly and gracefully, on his feet. Hence the readability of these printed addresses. A warmly appreciative Introduction is contributed by Hilaire Belloc, and an excellent memoir of some length follows from the pen of Mrs. Griffiths. Proud of her husband's appointment to the Liverpool office, she speaks of the consular service as enjoying "the halo surrounding the names of our three greatest men of letters, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Bret Harte, and W. D. Howells." In what grade below Bret Harte would she place, to take but one example, James Russell Lowell? Many honors were bestowed upon Griffiths in England, but no service rendered by him was greater than the one, not fully appreciated at the time, of promoting the Anglo-American good understanding that was to play so momentous a part a few years later.

MISS MERIEL BUCHANAN'S book entitled "The City of Trouble: Petrograd Since the Revolution" (Scribners; $1.35) is an account of events in the Russian capital between July, 1914, and the beginning of the Bolshevist régime. The author, a daughter of the former British Ambassador to Russia, vividly describes a military parade during Poincaré's visit to the Czar in that memorable summer of 1914, gives details of the murder of the monk Rasputin, and tells of the Revolution and subsequent events as she understands them. Miss Buchanan says that Kerensky failed "through his weakness at striking hard at the Bolsheviks and crushing them before they became too strong to be crushed. He was a patriot and an honest man, but he was an idealist who dreamt dreams that were too big for him, and that made him hesitate between right and wrong when a decisive action either way might have saved the situation." She dwells at length upon the "robbery and murder" which "had become daily and nightly occurrences" after the Bolshevik *coup d'état*, though apparently she saw little of it herself. But Miss Buchanan does not despair of Russia's future. "No—the soul of Russia was not dead, is not dead now!" she exclaims. And her belief is apparently based on the circumstance that at the Christmas party at the embassy a Russian guest, hearing the English officers sing "God Save the King," said to her "unsteadily": "You don't know what it means to hear your men sing that—while we have no Emperor and no country left." And a cab-man, on learning that she was English, said to her one day: "God knows what will happen—but certainly the Allies will be angry with us. Is it not so? England will no longer be our friend"—and he sank into sudden gloom.

A KEEN observer has been among us taking notes, and he has printed them in a book entitled "The New America" (Macmillan; $1.25). The author, Frank Dilnot, is an Englishman who has spent the past two years in acquainting himself with our country and its ways, with the result that he is moved to utter himself in some chapters of comment, mostly favorable. Pen portraits of public men and surveys of our great enterprises alternate with descriptions of the little things that betray national character. Yet, for all his keenness, the author's vision is at fault when he makes us a slow-moving people and says that "New York leads the way in this calm detached disregard of time." A more than doubtful compliment is paid in his cordial approbation of "the benevolent lenity of New York government"—a lenity that procured him the enjoyment of some Scotch whiskey under illegal conditions. He distinguishes between American and English humor by making the former "the more direct," the latter "the more allusive." Our grammar is criticised, as it deserves to be; but censure here is an instance of Satan rebuking sin. The critic's own pages abound in such laxities as "a society from which has sprung 400 similar organizations" and "he discovers how really different the food is to that which he has been accustomed." The book, too, is a marvel of erratic punctuation and non-punctuation. But it still remains an unusually shrewd and diverting bit of comment.

IN a small volume called "The Beginnings of Science" (Boston: Badger; $2), Edward T. Menge attempts to describe the relationship between philosophy and the laboratory sciences, in a series of chapters on such subjects as Genetics, Logic, Evolution, Vitalism, and so forth. His interpretation appears more complex and difficult of absorption than any of the volumes of direct scientific data which he attempts to explain. The writings of Huxley, Darwin, Kellogg, and Osborn are clarity itself compared to these labored, intricate, congested, and lifeless pages. Three didactic statements from a summary at the end of the book speak for themselves, and reflect the bias of the author: "We have attempted to impress any student of the Sciences . . . that there is not one particle of evidence that Man came from an animal ancestor; that all evidence on this score has been one-sided in that it took only physical comparisons, leaving out the psychical; that animals *never* think, but work by instinct and association."

WHOEVER in an undecided state of mind reads Miss Agnes Edwards's "Cape Cod" (Houghton Mifflin; $2), will inevitably choose to spend his summer on "The Cape." It may be the fragrance of bayberry clinging to childhood memories that these pages will revive. It may be that one's dreams of unseen New England are here visualized; it may be the love of the sturdy picturesque—of windmills, sand dunes, and white beaches; it may be nothing higher than a comfortable assurance of good motor roads and restful "neighborhoods." But the savor of Cape Cod is inherent throughout this volume, the charm of which is considerably enhanced by sympathetic sketches by Louis H. Ruyl.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Art

A Forgotten Artist

SOME five years ago I had the good fortune to find on a bookstall in the market at The Hague a large sketch-book in a vellum binding, full of studies in pencil and water-color of ships and sea-faring people, the work of an artist of no mean ability. The first page bore the signature "A. van Beest 1843." I had never heard of a painter of that name, nor could I get any information about him from connoisseurs among my acquaintances. Even the Director of the Mauritshuis at the Hague knew nothing of this A. van Beest. "It is sure to be work by Heemskerk van Beest" was the answer I usually received. But that could not be. Heemskerk van Beest was a third-rate seascape painter of the second half of the nineteenth century, whose pictures were more esteemed among his own aristocratic circle at The Hague than by the initiated. The vigorous draughtmanship, the lively portrayal of sea-faring life, the realism of the sailor types bordering on caricature, gave to these sketches by A. van Beest a characteristic touch of which the tame, soulless productions of Heemskerk van Beest are entirely devoid. A short article in Thieme-Becker's *Allgemeines Lexikon der Bildenden Künstler* gave me a clue. The artist it appears was born in Rotterdam on June 11, 1820, and died on August 8, 1860 in St. Luke's Hospital, New York. Prince Henry of the Netherlands took him with him on a three-years' cruise to the East. In America he lived mostly in Boston and New York. The marine painter W. Bradford and the landscape-painter R. Swain Gifford were his pupils. Of the whereabouts of his works the writer of the article gave but slight information: two sepia drawings in the Museum Fodor, Amsterdam, and two sketches in the print-room of the Rijksmuseum. That was all. However, though little esteemed by the directors of public collections in his native country, the artist had found his eulogist and biographer a few years after his death. Thieme-Becker referred to a study on the artist by a Frenchman: "Le Peintre de Marine Réaliste Albertus van Beest, Notice biographique par Auguste Demmin" (Paris, Librairie Vve. Jules Renouard 1863). From this notice, which I procured with some difficulty, I gathered that at the time of its publication most of the work done by the artist before his departure to America was still in the possession of Dutch amateurs. Is it likely that the drawings of this youthful prodigy, for which there was a general scramble, would not have found their way to collections at The Hague and Amsterdam? How, then, were the name and the work of this once famous artist so entirely forgotten that the mention of the former reminds every one of Heemskerk van Beest, and concerning the latter the Director of the Boymans Museum at Rotterdam was obliged to write to me: "Our gallery does not possess any works by Albertus van Beest, nor do I know of any in private collections in this city"?

I have a strong suspicion that Heemskerk van Beest ousted his more talented namesake from the memory of the present generation. Albertus was only twenty-five years old when he disappeared from the scene of his Bohemian existence, leaving the recollection behind of a dissipated rake whom a respectable, God-fearing citizen would do well to forget. No wonder, then, that the next generation mistook his work for that of his better-known but less gifted namesake.

That such was actually the case I can make probable by three indubitable instances of confusion of the two artists. As Van Beest had accompanied Prince Henry of the Netherlands on his cruises for three consecutive summers, I expected to find some documents relating to these voyages in the Royal House Archives. Professor Krämer, the learned keeper of the Queen's Record Office, denied that he had any papers concerning the artist under his care, adding that there were only a couple of sketch-books that had belonged to Heemskerk van Beest. He had them fetched for me. The larger of the two was labelled and bore the inscription: "Sketches of Sea-voyages of Prince Henry by Heemskerk van Beest 1845." But on opening the book I recognized at once the vigorous draughtmanship of Albertus van Beest. The drawings were unmistakably his, and some, moreover, bore the artist's signature. Shortly afterwards I called at the Municipal Record Office, Rotterdam, hoping there to find some information about the artist's life and connections. The keeper showed me a portrait in oil of Heemskerk van Beest by J. H. van de Laar, which, he informed me, had been presented by the heirs of that artist to the city of Rotterdam. My late experience at the Royal House Archives had made me suspicious. Why should this portrait of an aristocratic painter of The Hague, who never had any connections with Rotterdam, have been presented to that intensely democratic city? Besides, I had learned from Demmin's biographic notice that the painter's father possessed a portrait of his son done in his eighteenth year by a certain Van der Laan [*sic*]. The custodian, who shared my suspicion, made inquiries and found that the picture had not come from The Hague but was a gift of Mr. A. G. van Beest, Rotterdam, a great-nephew of Albertus. Again, in the Maritime Museum, Rotterdam, I discovered a seascape bearing the signature A. van Beest, but ascribed on the frame to Heemskerk van Beest.

After I made these discoveries other facts concerning the artists were brought to light by Mr. Wiersum, the Keeper of the Rotterdam Record Office, who had begun to take an interest in the forgotten painter. His grandparents, of good Dutch stock, had been residents of Rotterdam, where they were married in the year 1787. Their first child was the painter's father, who, at the age of thirty-two on June 13, 1820, registered at the Rotterdam town-hall the birth of twins, Albertus and Anna. The little girl died in the following year. The boy, who grew up to manhood, probably caused his parents greater grief than his sister did by dying at that early age. If we are to believe Demmin, he grew up like a savage, impatient of all control, a favorite of the rough sailors in the docks but seldom at home under his father's roof. He is said to have acquired his amazing skill as a draughtsman without the help of any master, but the work he left behind seems to refute this legend of his artistic development. It shows a loving observance of the technique of his art, such as the self-made, untutored genius, whom Demmin would have us believe him to have been, would doubtless have

Many distinguished American and foreign authors have said that the **Modern Library** is one of the most stimulating factors in American intellectual life. Practically everybody who knows anything about good books owns a number of copies of the Modern Library and generally promises himself to own them all. One of the largest book stores in the country reports that more copies of the Modern Library are purchased for gifts than any other books now being issued.

Many of the books in the Modern Library are not reprints but are new books which cannot be found in any other edition. None of them can be had in any such convenient and attractive form. It would be difficult to find any other editions of any of these books at double the price. They can be purchased wherever books are sold or you can get them from us.

At all bookstores, 70c per copy
Send to us for our Spring Catalogue

Boni & Liveright, 109 W. 40th St., New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

despised. "Il raisonnait admirablement sur l'esthétique de son art," says his biographer, but is it likely that a boy who had never consorted with any but sailors and dock-workers would have learnt to meditate and reason about the principles of his art? It may very well be that Jan Hendrik van de Laar, the history painter who did Van Beest's portrait when he was a boy of eighteen, had a share in the training of his talent. In that portrait, now at the Record Office, Rotterdam, one would not suspect the unkempt waif of the docks whom Demmin is so fond of describing. He himself has noticed the contrast between that picture and his own portrayal of the youth: "Là, du moins, on lui trouve une tête assez distinguée, un beau front et un extérieur convenable." Besides, it is hardly credible that Mr. Rijk, the Minister of Marine at The Hague, would have recommended the artist to Prince Henry of the Netherlands, the Admiral of the Dutch fleet, if the real Van Beest had answered better to the description Demmin gave of him than to the portrait painted by Van de Laar. Prince Henry was evidently pleased with him, for he appointed him midshipman on his flagship. In July 1843 he went on board, together with two other marine painters, the Frenchman Gudin and the Hollander Schotel. The smaller one of the two albums at The Royal House Archives contains the sketches done by the three artists during that summer's cruise. Gudin's contribution to the book is limited to one water-color drawing, an "hommage au Prince Henry à bord du Rhin, 15 Juillet, 1843." But the two Hollanders have filled its pages in turns, Schotel with carefully finished water-colors, Van Beest with rapid sketches in sepia of Mediterranean coasts and ports, which show him far superior to the older and much more famous artist.

Three consecutive summers Van Beest accompanied Prince Henry on these cruises, on the Mediterranean and to the far North. The collection of Mr. G. H. Moll, Rotterdam, which was sold in April, 1891, contained, among many other works of Van Beest, six Norwegian sketches and a painting described in the catalogue as "A view on the coast of Iceland." During these voyages he was sometimes seized by fits of wild fury, which made it necessary to shut him up in the hold. Intemperance seems to have been the cause of these paroxysms. When Demmin made his acquaintance in Amsterdam his appearance bore the marks of a dissolute life. "Beast" he was called by his contemporaries, with a play on his name. Numerous stories about his extravagances gave him that notoriety which became disastrous to the memory of the man and his work. He had no scruples in selling the same picture three times over and would give it away to a fourth comer in a sudden fit of generosity. One day, having a few friends to dine with him in his studio, he made the fire on which he cooked the dinner flame up more quickly by throwing on to it a series of his drawings which he tore one after another out of a large sketch-book, saying: "That fire will cost me some three-hundred dollars, but no matter as long as the fish is well done." One evening, in the year 1845, he peeped in at the door where his mother was sitting and said to her: "I am going away presently for a couple of days. I shall soon be back. Good night, mother." Then he went without money, without luggage except his drawing materials, and was never seen or heard from again. Fifteen years later his parents received, from the Dutch Consul in Boston, the news of his death.

There have of late been some symptoms of a reviving interest in the painter and his work among his own countrymen. In October of last year the art collection of Mr. de Lannoy, Amsterdam, was exhibited in that city, containing pictures, prints and drawings illustrative of Dutch sea-faring life. Twenty-six of the exhibits were drawings by Albertus van Beest, and they were declared by common assent to form the most valuable part of the collection. That he was an artist of such uncommon gifts was a revelation to the connoisseurs. One critic deemed his work superior to that of the great marine painters of the seventeenth century: "Those old masters, indeed, excelled in accuracy of observation, but their work lacks emotion. Van Beest, on the contrary, is an inspired, impassioned artist, his ships seem alive, we feel the wind play in the sails on his vigorous sketches."

A. J. Barnouw

Finance

Co-operating to Lower Commodity Prices

THE Federal Government, under the auspices of the committee appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, has entered upon an experiment which is exciting the attention of economists and business men throughout the world. In the belief that prices, commodity and raw material, can be lowered through intelligent coöperation, an effort has been made to obtain united action by the Government authorities, the manufacturers, and the consumers to readjust prices in such a way as to increase public demand for the commodities and provide for a largely increased employment of labor. A strong committee has been appointed to investigate the situation and to ascertain what is a fair basis of prices for various industries.

This plan is based really on what has been done in the copper industry, where the price reduction and the stabilization process are pretty well advanced. At the time that the armistice was signed, the copper producers were taking out of the mines 600,000,000 pounds of copper a year. This acceleration was directly due to the unusual efforts which had been put forth to increase production for war purposes. As soon as hostilities ceased, there was naturally a sharp falling off in this demand and the situation became serious. It was apparent that many thousand miners would be without work and that some of the producing companies would be in financial straits. Representatives of the different interests concerned held a conference with the Government officials and some of the largest consumers. A sharp reduction in price was agreed upon, the Government

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

"The most important translation that has come out of Spain in our time in the field of fiction, and it will be remembered as epochal."—John Garrett Underhill (Representative Spanish Authors' Society)

CAESAR or NOTHING

By PIO BAROJA

Translated by Louis How

Baroja is regarded by many people as the greatest of living Spanish novelists. This is in Spain his most popular novel. It is witty, worldly, and entertaining. Characters are depicted with a shrewdness and insight that will surprise Americans who, having read such Spanish novels as have thus far appeared in this country, feel themselves already familiar with contemporary Spanish fiction.

$1.75 *net. At all bookshops.*

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 West Forty-second St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and other purchasers making considerable purchases at the new level.

The new price level thus obtained for the copper industry was not immediately successful in largely increasing consumption. It prepared the way, however, for a better understanding between producer and consumer with the result that the readjustment process was speeded up. There have been subsequent sales of copper at a lower level than that named at the Washington conference. But the movement was successful in that it brought the industry to a price basis at which business could be done. And this is just the end sought by those directing the present movement of nation-wide proportions.

The steel makers have fallen into line, announcing their intention of coöperating with the Government committee. The movement will be immediately extended to other industries and a genuine effort will be made to assist the shifting of business from a war basis to a peace level. Such coöperation is required especially in the building industry, where stagnation has long prevailed. Should the movement be successful in this industry, it would result in increased activity in various lines and provide employment for a large portion of those who are without work. The need is urgent, since this is the time of year when building operations ordinarily expand and there is a broad demand for labor in connection with the development of important building projects. The country is heavily short of housing accommodations and the railroads will have to undertake important construction work as soon as the funds can be provided. There is reason to believe, therefore, that a nation-wide revival in the building industry would be of great importance in quickening general trade and in providing employment for those who have been in the Government service, or at work in the munition plants.

WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Jacobs, Joseph. Jewish Contributions to Civilization. Jewish Publication Society.

Michaud, Régis. Mystiques et Réalistes Anglo-Saxons. Paris: Armand Colin.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Hyndman, H. M. Clemenceau: The Man and His Time. Stokes. $2.

Mathiez, Albert. La Conspiration de l'Etranger. Paris: Armand Colin.

Robertson, C. Grant. Bismarck. Holt. $2.25.

POETRY

Cooper, James F. Afterglow. Yale University Press. $1.

Housman, Lawrence. The Heart of Peace. Small, Maynard. $1.25.

Neihardt, John G. The Song of Three Friends. Macmillan. $1.25.

Van Dyke, Henry. Golden Stars and Other Verses. Scribner. 50 cts.

FICTION

Carter, Jefferson. Madam Constantia. Longmans. $1.50.

Farmer, Jean. César-Napoléon Gaillard. Paris: Payot & Cie.

Fuessle, Newton A. The Flail. Moffat, Yard. $1.60.

Goodwin, Ernest. The Duchess of Siona. Houghton Mifflin. $1.60.

Stendhal. The Red and the Black. Dutton. $2.

Webster, Nesta H. The Sheep Track. Dutton. $1.60.

White, Edward L. The Song of the Sirens. Dutton. $1.90.

Williams, Valentine. Okewood of the Secret Service. McBride. $1.50.

LABOR

The crux of the reconstruction problem is the relation between capital and labor. To everyone interested in this problem, these two books are recommended. Written by leading authorities they illuminate from different angles the whole labor question and give just the knowledge that is needed for an understanding of the new era of industrial relations.

INDUSTRY AND HUMANITY

By Hon. W. L. MacKENZIE KING

This volume, the result of years of study and experience as Canadian Labor minister, investigator, etc., shows how the struggle between capital and labor can, and must, be settled by peaceful methods.

"The underlying causes of industrial unrest, the evolution of industrial phenomena, the essential features of industrial processes, the rights and functions of labor, capital, management and community are brought out in forceful manner."—*Industrial Management.*

" . . . Of immense value. The most practical of books concerning the industrial problem."—*North American Review.* $3.00 net.

INSTINCTS IN INDUSTRY

By ORDWAY TEAD

"No one who comes in contact with or handles labor in any way can fail to find information of value in it."—*American Machinist.*

"Mr. Tead has joined the things that every intelligent employer has observed and the things that every intelligent psychologist has observed and has made the employers' observations scientific, and the psychologists' observation practicable."—*Chicago Daily News.*

"To employers who want to know 'what is the matter' with their employes, what impulses determine their efficiency, we recommend 'Instincts in Industry.' Practical manufacturers can spend a very profitable couple of hours with this author, who has gathered his material at first hand, dealing with labor problems as an industrial counsel."—*Babson Statistical Organization Bulletin.* $1.40 net.

MORAL RECONSTRUCTION

RIGHT AND WRONG AFTER THE WAR

By Rev. BERNARD IDDINGS BELL

"Fresh, bold, and suggestive thinking."—*Boston Transcript.* "This book treats of such vital problems as feminism, poverty, and birth control. Mr. Bell sees that a revision of our Christian ethics is in order."—*Chicago Evening Post.* $1.25 net.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
BOSTON and NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1919 No. 2803

English Social Democracy During the War

By H. M. HYNDMAN

IN Great Britain, as elsewhere, the war has caused a serious split in the Socialist ranks. There were sections before: there is at this moment sharp antagonism. It is idle to talk of unity when there is a wide difference of opinion on a fundamental question of principle. Immediately before the war began, all Socialist and labor groups joined in the great peace demonstration in Trafalgar Square. Though unfortunately convinced, myself, that the Kaiser and the Federal Council of Germany were resolved upon war, I drafted the resolution which was passed unanimously at that meeting and took the chair at one of the platforms. A few days later all Socialist and labor organizations joined in the formation of the National Workers' War Emergency Committee, representing 4,500,000 heads of families, upon which both pro-Ally and pacifist parties were fully represented. This organization, in spite of the fundamental scission on the war, did extremely good domestic work throughout the trying four years through which the country passed.

Sitting on this Committee as the delegate of the National Socialist party, I do not hesitate to say that had our Socialist suggestions, especially in relation to the organization of the cultivation of our own land, the complete socialization of land transport, and the nationalization of shipping been carried out from September, 1914, onward, we should not have undergone any hardship at all in Great Britain from high prices and shortage of necessary food. Consequently, we should not have had to rely so largely upon the self-sacrifice and loyalty of the United States to save us from actual starvation. Our suggestions, which had the approval of some of the ablest experts in England in every department, were pooh-poohed with true bureaucratic arrogance and ignorance by Government officials, who jeered at us as Utopians and criers for the moon. When it was too late they were compelled, by the sheer exigency of the case—the submarine campaign, let us never forget, was as nearly as possible successful in starving England out—to adopt, in half-hearted, unscientific fashion, some of our proposals. That has been the way throughout.

Nevertheless, Socialists succeeded in getting bread maintained at a reasonable price; in securing fairly decent treatment and allowances for the wives, whether regularly married or not, of our soldiers, with their children; in obtaining better rates of pension for wounded and disabled soldiers than would otherwise have been had; in preventing landlords from raising their rents to exorbitant figures; in supporting demands for higher wages, especially for the women workers, made necessary by the great rise in prices; and in pressing forward the establishment of national or communal kitchens. In other words, socialism did make itself felt, not by any means to the extent which its supporters hoped and desired, but still in directions which all can realize and appreciate. It is astonishing that, in view of the opposition of the old bourgeois economists, still very strong even among the labor men, the trade unionists, and the coöperators pure and simple, socialism was able to obtain as much as it did.

Every advance made on the road towards collective action for the benefit of all, through pressure brought to bear upon the upper class minority by the workers themselves, is a step forward which it will be exceedingly difficult to retrace after the war. But it is very remarkable indeed that not a single measure of real value to the overwhelming majority of the people of Great Britain has been brought forward by the governing classes—not even the rationing of short supplies of food—until they were forced to recognize, by popular clamor and the obvious danger of popular tumult, that any further delay in applying the remedies demanded would be perilous for them.

I have referred to the National Socialist party. This party consists of the old pioneers of the Social-Democratic Federation and the men and women who have been glad to coöperate with them and follow their lead. Nearly all the younger men of the party have been either fighting at the front, or in camp or hospital at home, or overworked as skilled employees in the factories. There are no pacifists or conscientious objectors of any kind in the National Socialist party. But, in consequence of the devotion of its men to the national service, the party has inevitably been shorthanded for all purposes of agitation or propaganda during the war.

The reason for the formation of the National Socialist party was the vehement pacifism of a very large portion, perhaps the majority, of the British Socialist party, composed, in London at any rate, chiefly of naturalized Germans, Russian Jews, conscientious objectors, and the sort of Teutonized Socialists with whom America is familiar. These men and women never lost an opportunity of declaring that Great Britain, France, and Belgium were as much the aggressors as Germany. After a vain attempt to maintain a factitious unity, each section upholding its own view, the pro-war Socialists were at last compelled to do what they ought to have done at first—form themselves into a separate organization. Their principles are the same that they have always been, namely:

1. The demand that the mass of the wage-earners, who constitute the majority of the entire population and produce and distribute the wealth of the community, shall, by political and peaceful organization, obtain control of all the economic resources of the country.

2. That while a coöperative commonwealth of this character is being established in Great Britain, for the benefit of all classes, British Socialists should make every possible effort to maintain the closest international relations with men and women in all countries who are endeavoring to bring about Socialist reorganization on the same lines in their respective countries.

3. The right and duty of every nationality to enforce by arms the independence of its own nationality from any external control, and to maintain a navy and a national democratic citizen

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army of all citizens, trained from their youth to the use of arms, in order to protect themselves, and friendly nations that might be threatened, from foreign aggression.

These are the principles of the National Socialists. The party was not and is not prepared to change them in deference to Germany or any other Power. It was quite confident, in fact, that the victory of Germany and her confederates would and could only mean the supremacy of brutal militarism in Europe, which would put back the progress of democracy and socialism for at least fifty years. Therefore, while the party continued to press its social and political programme as vigorously as circumstances would permit, and affiliated itself with the Labor party—which is not a Socialist party—in order to keep in touch, as far as possible, with the organized forces of the wage-earners, it never ceased to declare its entire sympathy with the Allies and to associate itself in every possible way with those Englishmen who were doing their utmost to crush the aggressive power of Germany and its Allies.

It was in support of this policy that the National Socialist party strongly opposed and succeeded in defeating the proposed International Socialist Congress, at Stockholm or elsewhere, during the war, at which the German Social Democrats would have been represented. The German Social Democrats had betrayed the cause of international socialism, at the beginning of the war and throughout its course, by persistently voting for the war credits which they had publicly pledged themselves to vote against; by acting as the tools of the Kaiser in the Reichstag, in the constituencies, and in the press; and by never entering any definite protest against the atrocities committed by German sailors and soldiers. Such conduct of itself, in the opinion of the National Socialist party, shut out Scheidemann, Heine, Ebert, David, Südekum, and others from any right to hold intercourse with the Socialists of the Allied nations. This was not the view of the Independent Labor party, or of the British Socialist party, or of Mr. Arthur Henderson, the secretary of the Labor party. They were influenced largely by Camille Huysmans, the Belgian Socialist, and by Pieter Troelstra, the Dutch Socialist, whom the National Socialists regard as a pro-German agent.

All these troubles in the Socialist parties, leading to serious splits in every country, have been accompanied, so far as Great Britain is concerned, by a development of collectivism and floating socialism which is very surprising. The Labor party, as has already been said, is not definitely a Socialist party; yet, if its present programme were fully realized in practice, we should all of us be within easy hail of the coöperative commonwealth. The same is, in the main, true of the majority of trade unionists. More important is the general effect of the war upon the whole community. To my mind, we have made more progress towards the realization of Socialist ideals by the removal of prejudice during the four years of war than we should have made in forty years of peace. Nearly all of our Departments are now in public hands. Nationalization, which used to be preached in vain as the first essential reform of our anarchic competitive system, came with a rush, because it was proved to demonstration that the uncoördinated methods of private property and company property could not cope with the emergency. Government control and bureaucratic management have proved to a great extent wasteful, inefficient, and corrupt; but they have at least enabled us, in spite of the almost incredible blundering of our politicians, to fight the war through to victory. Those who assert that the drawbacks are due to socialism are entitled to be told that it is the middle class and upper class, and not the wage-earners, who have had the management of the whole thing. They, therefore, are responsible for the mistakes; the admirable spirit, discipline, and power of adaptation displayed by the people under the new circumstances have ensured success in spite of the incapacity above.

Then the rough handling by the state of profiteers and profiteering has shown in practice that cost of production and distribution, not demand and supply, can be beneficially applied as the basis of regulated price for the whole community. True, owing to the moral cowardice of our leading men, the small retailers have to a large extent been kept in control for the purpose of "maintaining the present system in being." But, even so, we have all of us learned that only by state and municipal control of prices and sale of necessary products can disorderly queues and anarchic disturbance be prevented. Rationing of supplies so that, however rich a family might be, it could get no more than its fair share of what was available; fixation of price by Order in Council to prevent shopkeepers from fleecing customers; heavy fines and imprisonment for hoarding—these and similar measures have, at any rate, partially taught individualistic Englishmen that the community at large can alone be trusted to protect its members. As an active member of the Food Consumers' Council in the Ministry of Food, I saw all this at very close range; and, making every allowance for error due to inexperience, I fail to see how we could possibly have got through our difficulties without such semi-Socialist organization. What I saw from the one side I know, from close investigation, that the people have seen quite as clearly from the other. As one article after another was priced and rationed, order to a great degree replaced anarchy. It has been a fine lesson to the whole people, and the whole people have been learning it.

All the while, too, the great coöperative societies have been managing their own business extremely well. They are, it should be remembered, strictly working-class organizations. They have been established by the working-class for the working-class, and they are managed by the working-class. They have 3,000,000 members and 11,000,000 customers—more than a fourth of the total population of Great Britain—and from first to last they have coped well with the difficulties. Of course there have been mistakes, but nothing at all comparable to the number made by our highly intelligent, well-educated administrators. As a result of the war, the prestige of these working-class coöperative societies has been enormously increased. At the very beginning I suggested, and was very anxious, that the Government, without interfering with the actual management of this vast distributing and, in part, producing agency, should bring it into direct touch with the state Departments, help the coöperators to expand their sphere of usefulness in every direction, enforce membership in coöperative societies upon all state employees, and thus during the war lay the foundations of coöperation for the whole population after the war. I am confident that this was the right course to pursue, and that, if it had been followed, we should now be on the high road to the reintegration and scientific economic coördination of our production and distribution which must follow upon the peace.

Three things are essential to bring about a peaceful social transformation or revolution in any country: (1) that the economic and social forms should, unconsciously or consciously, have reached the stage where such transformation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is almost immediately inevitable; (2) that the people should themselves be sufficiently educated to understand the stage of social development to which their country has attained, and therefore be able to act harmoniously themselves in the common interest; and (3) that the political institutions of the nation should be so far advanced as to give a full outlet to the social aspirations of the people, mainly engendered by economic necessity.

In Great Britain at the present time society fulfils only the first of these three conditions. As a consequence, we are drifting into peace as we drifted into war. The arrangements made for meeting the dangers ahead are as yet insufficient. Men and women, unavoidably turned out of the factories engaged upon furnishing the munitions of death, have to face an interregnum during which these same vast implements of industry are being transformed into engines for the production of the munitions of life. It is no easy matter to solve the problem. The men who are being discharged from the armies at the front and in camp will not consent to return to the miserable conditions of life which they left in order to defend a country the soil of which belongs to 34,000 persons. The workers at home, on their part, will not submit to any material reduction of wages. Unemployed men and women will cry with justice: "If we can all be employed and fairly paid in war, why not in peace?" This is the difficulty that lies ahead of us. The problems arising out of these conditions cannot be solved by mere adoration of the money fetish, or by enunciation of the fallacies of bourgeois economics to men and women who are organized, trained, and (in the case of the men) armed and disciplined as they have never been before in our history. Socialism and coöperation have made enormous strides in Great Britain, and are certain to continue to make gains; but unless the upper and middle classes display far more foresight, intelligence, and self-sacrifice than they seem at present likely to exhibit, the struggle for the full realization of the new epoch may be desperate indeed.

The Position of the Russian Intelligentsia

By MARK PODOLIANIN

THE separation between America and Russia to-day is probably greater than at any time in the previous history of the two countries. To the thousands of miles of distance and the difference in race, habits, language, and historical development has been added a mass of misunderstandings, misrepresentations, and prejudices. Yet, despite these obstacles, American intellectuals of the radical and even liberal type have found it possible to express their sympathy for liberated Russia and have often shown a remarkable comprehension of the real nature of the Russian revolutionary drama. The picture of Bolshevist Russia drawn for the American public by certain correspondents of American daily newspapers has not frightened American liberals. They have been slow to believe that Lenine and Trotzky were paid agents of the Kaiser, and many of them have not hesitated to express their opinion about the so-called Sisson documents—an opinion not altogether to the credit of Mr. Creel and his associates.

There is, however, one important phase of the Russian revolution which has been largely overlooked by American liberal opinion, namely, that which has to do with the relations between the Russian *intelligentsia* and the Government of People's Commissars. Ever since the overthrow of the Kerensky Government, in November, 1917, American newspapers have from time to time told of massacres and other outrages which the Soviets were said to have committed against what one paper called "the brains of the country"—the Russian *intelligentsia*. Persons who read about the executions of "Babushka" Breshkovskaya or Maria Spiridonova, or of Maxim Gorky's death from starvation, or other reports of the same kind, only to discover later that Madame Breshkovskaya had come to this country and that Spiridonova and Maxim Gorky had joined the Soviets, naturally ceased in time to become excited over any of these reported massacres.

Yet in all of these newspaper reports, as in the story about the "St. Bartholomew night," there is a modicum of truth. As a matter of fact, the Russian *intelligentsia* as a whole were, and to some degree still are, opposed to the Bolsheviki and to the Soviet form of government. To those American liberals who are acquainted with the history of the Russian *intelligentsia* and their revolutionary record of nearly a century and a half, the present opposition of that group to the most revolutionary Government in the world may well seem to be a puzzle, some explanation of which is needed if certain events in Soviet Russia are properly to be understood. Mr. Albert R. Williams, who has contributed much to our knowledge of Soviet Russia, has called attention to the economic factor; he thinks that the Russian *intelligentsia*, which is bourgeois in its habits, turned against the Bolsheviki because the latter endangered some of its habits. This may be true of certain groups and of individual intellectuals, but not of the entire *intelligentsia*. When, in the seventies of the last century, hundreds of Russian intellectuals donned peasant garb and scattered over the country with the purpose of getting nearer to the people and pointing out to them the way to a better life, they not only renounced their bourgeois habits, but they also risked and even paid with their freedom and lives for this adventure. The examples are numerous in the history of the *intelligentsia*.

The causes which led the Russian *intelligentsia* into the camp of the enemies of the Soviet Government can be properly understood only by bearing in mind one important fact. The truth is that the *intelligentsia*, although still regarded as a distinct and separated group, are in fact a very heterogeneous body. Since the upheaval of 1905 the *intelligentsia* have been undergoing a rapid process of differentiation. During the revolution of 1905 political parties were definitely formed, and the intellectuals became members of these various parties. Many members of the reactionary Octobrist party, and almost the entire membership of the Cadet party, are intellectuals. The majority of leaders of the Mensheviki and of the Right and Left Social Revolutionary parties are intellectuals, as are Lenine, Trotzky, Lunacharsky, Zinoviev, Kameniev, Joffe, Tchitcherin, and many other leaders of the Bolsheviki. Before the revolution of 1905 the Socialist and anti-Socialist in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tellectuals were united by their strong opposition to the autocracy. The March revolution found the ties which bound together various groups of the *intelligentsia* actually very loose, and the November revolution finally tore those ties in pieces. As a consequence, it is impossible to-day to regard the *intelligentsia* as a unit with a definite ideal or programme; on the contrary, it is necessary to explain the attitude of each group separately towards the Soviet Government. For the present purpose it will be sufficient to speak only of the three major groups into which the entire *intelligentsia* may easily be divided. These are the bourgeois intellectuals, the neurasthenics, and the revolutionary but anti-Bolshevist intellectuals.

It is hardly necessary to explain why intellectuals of the Octobrist or Cadet parties, for example, are opposed to the Soviet Government. These parties represent the rich gentry and the bourgeoisie, i. e., classes which are bound to perish, if they have not perished yet, under the Soviet Government. It is only natural that they should oppose, by every means in their power, a Government which cannot and will not tolerate them.

Much more interesting from the psychological standpoint is the attitude of the second group of intellectuals, the neurasthenics, towards the November revolution. Intellectuals of this type are to be found in every country in the world; but in Russia, thanks to the autocracy with its prohibition of everything, the neurasthenic intellectuals are especially numerous. Russian literature has more than once portrayed the type. These intellectuals were able to talk, to criticize, and to dream, but were not able to act. The revolution to them was a beautiful goddess to whom they dedicated their songs, the people a fetish which they worshipped; but when the real revolution came and the people themselves began to speak and to act, when a Soviet Government was being formed and hard and strenuous work had to be done, the neurasthenics were not in evidence. Instead, they had already begun to dream about the past as a time of beauty, exactly as other Europeans have dreamed about the Middle Ages as a time of romance.

Of greater significance is the attitude of the revolutionary, non-Bolshevist *intelligentsia* towards the November revolution. Many persons were hasty in concluding that if the Russian revolutionary *intelligentsia* itself was against the Soviet Government, there must be something wrong with that Government and with the Bolshevik party which tried to promote it. The history of the Russian *intelligentsia* offers a satisfactory explanation of what appears to be a puzzling attitude.

In the first place, the aims of the Russian *intelligentsia* as a group were always purely political. Economically, the Russian intellectuals were generally better off than many of their European brethren. Their social position was important, but not so their position in politics. The autocracy frowned upon even the merest suggestion of sharing its power with the *intelligentsia*, with the result of making that influential group its deadliest enemy. It is true that the revolutionary *intelligentsia* fought for the land with the peasants, and for higher wages, shorter hours, and other labor reforms with the workers; it is also true that they did so with the utmost sincerity and the greatest self-sacrifice; yet they did as they did simply because they knew only too well that without the aid of those classes they could never win political freedom. When, accordingly, the March revolution fulfilled the long-cherished dream of the *intelligentsia*, the latter saw no necessity of new revolutionary acts. They tried to convince the workers and peasants that the Constituent Assembly would decide everything in the best possible way, and when they failed to stop the revolution among the workers and peasants, they turned against the revolution.

In the second place, the *intelligentsia* did not believe in the possibility of realizing socialism in Russia at the present time. It must be remembered that, throughout their history, the Russian *intelligentsia* were faithful pupils of western Europe. Every new idea, every theory which originated in the "civilized West," found its ready exponents among them. Socialism has been the most popular creed among the intellectuals for the last fifty years, but, knowing that socialism was born of capitalism, they believed that it must therefore come about first in the most capitalistic countries. This idea was the religion of the *intelligentsia* for years. With such a state of mind, it was only natural that the *intelligentsia* should spurn any suggestion of Bolshevist "home-made" socialism. Western Europe and America did not as yet have socialism; how then could backward Russia have it? Western Europe had developed a parliamentary state apparatus, and Russia must accept it for the time-being, although clearly perceiving its defects. Such was the reasoning. The idea that Russia would eventually develop a new state apparatus of its own was entirely foreign to these Western-trained minds.

Such are the chief causes which made one of the most revolutionary groups of Russia turn against the revolution, and caused a Socialist group to oppose even with arms the introduction of socialism. The early, and for a time the only, friends of the workers and peasants became their bitterest enemies. The intellectuals deserted the people and left them almost helpless in the face of tremendous odds.

Nevertheless, facts are stronger than theories, and even such theoretical minds as those of the Russian intellectuals have begun to see a new light. The continued existence of the Federated Socialist Soviet Republic of Russia, despite a world of enemies, has already convinced many of the *intelligentsia*. One by one they are joining the forces of the Soviet Republic and the "iron battalions of the proletariat." The day is apparently approaching when they will realize that their opportunities are greater than have ever been the opportunities of intellectuals anywhere. Perhaps, too, the world outside will understand that Russia, which assuredly has need of brains to establish and develop it in its new form, has not adopted a policy of deliberately destroying the brains which it possesses.

Contributors to This Issue

H. M. HYNDMAN, founder of the Social Democratic Federation, is the president of the National Socialist party in Great Britain, editor of *Justice*, and author of numerous books and articles on social and political subjects. His latest book is a biography of Clemenceau.

MARK PODOLIANIN is a New York journalist.

COUNT VON BROCKDORFF-RANTZAU, the German Minister of Foreign Affairs, is reported to have been designated as one of the German delegates to the peace conference.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Foreign Policy of Germany

THE following outline of the proposed foreign policy of Germany, laid before the Weimar Assembly on February 14 by Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau, Minister of Foreign Affairs, seems not to have been reported in the American press. The earlier paragraphs below are taken from *L'Humanité* (Paris) of February 16, which gives the rest of the speech in summary only. The later paragraphs, beginning with the words "Unfortunately, we cannot say," are taken from *La France Libre* (Paris) of the same date, which summarizes the preceding paragraphs. The *Gaulois*, like *L'Humanité*, makes the Foreign Minister say that Germany cannot enter into the league of nations without colonies. The *Journal des Débats* and the *Matin*, on the contrary, quote him as saying that "Germany can also enter into the league of peoples without colonies."

"My confirmation in my office makes it my right and my duty to render to you an account of the main lines on which I propose to conduct foreign policies within the framework of the general policies of the Government. I can outline the tasks of German foreign policy under two heads—the ending of the state of war, and the establishment of normal relations with the community of peoples.

"Unfortunately, the voluntary disarmament of Germany has not softened the enemy. They have recently made an effort to settle, on the basis of disarmament, questions which incontestably belong to the peace conference. I have resisted the attempt and shall resist it in the future also. We are in process of breaking up all of our old military force, and of replacing our old peace-time army, of which we might well make use in the East, by new republican troops.

"Germany has taken upon herself the consequences of defeat and is resolved to observe the conditions which have been arranged in agreement between her and her adversaries. These conditions mean the complete renunciation of the political aims of the former Germany.

"We are ready to accept the restrictions upon our sovereignty, obligatory submission of our differences with other states to an international arbitration tribunal, and renunciation of our armament, if our former adversaries and future neighbors will submit to the same restrictions.

"We recognize that the position which Germany took at the peace conferences at the Hague in regard to these two fundamental questions involved a bitter mistake for which our whole people must to-day atone. But this recognition does not imply any admission that Germany was, as our enemies proclaim, the sole cause of the world war. Accordingly, we hold firmly to the Wilsonian principles according to which no war indemnity should be paid to the victor nor any territory ceded to him.

"If we reconstruct what we destroyed in the regions which we occupied, we wish to do so by our free labor. We protest against the fact that our prisoners of war are made to do slave labor.

"Considering that our adversaries owe victory in great part not to a military but to an economic war, it follows that the peace should be not only a political peace but also, in large measure, an economic peace.

"Accordingly, we may assume that the decisions of the Paris Economic Conference will be given up. A discriminatory treatment, even temporary, of Germany as regards commerce and transportation it would be impossible for us to accept. Germany also must change her commercial methods. Freedom of the seas is the condition of freedom of commerce. That is in any case one of the most important points for Germany of the Wilsonian programme.

"Germany cannot enter into the league of nations without colonies. We approve the plan for international control over tropical colonies, on condition that all the colonial Powers submit to this plan and that Germany receives a suitable share of the products of these colonies. On the other hand, we must expect to lose precious parts of our own national territory. It is above all a question of Alsace-Lorraine. Violence is done to the right of the present population of Alsace-Lorraine when the French troops of occupation consider the country as one definitively conquered, and expel or arrest all the elements in whom they see an obstacle to their imperialist plans; and when they repress the natural right of the people in the matter of language by compulsory "Frenchification." From the fact that the peace conference has not yet put its seal upon a decision regarding the fate of Alsace-Lorraine, we draw the conclusion that we are entitled to intervene in favor of the right of this province to be heard in the determination of its destiny. The French plan to join the Prussian territory of the Saar and the Bavarian palatinate to Alsace-Lorraine indicates an imperialist policy which ought to be condemned as energetically as were the old designs of the German expansionists upon the Longwy and Briey basins. Germany and France must not forever consider themselves as hereditary enemies and face one another armed to the teeth. It will be the task of the peace conference to create safeguards which will make such a state of things appear an absurdity; only let them not tear from us parts of the national territory which are regions of vital importance."

After speaking of the plan of constituting a Rhenish and Westphalian republic and of the movement in southern Germany for separation from Berlin, the Minister remarked that if the line of the Main might perhaps have some advantages at the present moment, in the long run such a separation would certainly lead to the destruction of the political and economic independence of the separated parties.

"A united state is the vital form, the natural form, of Germany. We do not think of making Germans of the Swiss or the Dutch. Of the Scandinavian peoples we annex only the legends of the past and the poets of the present. But with our Austrian brothers we formed a single Germanic nation down to the fall of the Holy Roman Empire. We had a common history. If we now find ourselves together we know that we are only endeavoring to correct a mistake committed at the time when the Empire was founded; the conference of peace surely will not refuse its sanction to this correction. From now on we shall energetically protest against any violence toward the German Austrians on the part of their former compatriots.

"Unfortunately, we cannot say that in the Polish state we shall have an easy neighbor. It is and will remain the object of our efforts to find a *modus vivendi*, taking into account common interests, above all the recognition of Polish rights to assured traffic with the Baltic. This problem can be solved by an agreement regulating navigation on the Vistula and the railway question and by port concessions, without any prejudice whatsoever to the sovereignty of the inalienable territory of the state. Germany likewise would have no objection to having these rights, and Polish independence in general, placed under an international guarantee, always assuming that nothing in it was directed against a particular neighbor.

"What is just for the Poles and the Germans is conceded to the German Danes. In view of the turn which things have taken, it is to be hoped that an example will be given on our northern boundary of how, after long conflicts, a lasting and genuine reconciliation of peoples may be arrived at by means of straightforward discussions and voluntary agreement.

"Germany has decided to coöperate enthusiastically in the erection of the society of nations, although our opponents will admit us only with deep distrust. This distrust we must overcome by proof of our desire for peace. We will give one proof of this kind, first of all, by definitely turning away from our old policy of armament; for while a foreign policy which rests upon superiority in armed force is, it is true, an easy policy, it is evil and sterile. In any case you cannot expect from me a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conduct of affairs which is constantly putting its hand to the sword to realize its intentions, but, on the contrary, one which inspires in the other side the conviction that it is to its own interest to share our views.

"Material disarmament should go on parallel with spiritual disarmament. Differences of a juridical nature between us and another people should be discussed in a conciliatory spirit, and differences which cannot be smoothed out should be submitted to the judgment of an arbitral tribunal. . . .

"The league of nations needs coercive means for the execution of its decisions. A people is not at liberty to renounce a considerable part of its sovereignty—a renunciation necessitated by the league of nations—unless it shares in the executive power. We cannot enter a society of nations in which we are to be exclusively the objects of executive power.

"The question of social evolution and of labor interests must be met after the world war. It would be prejudicial to conscientious and progressive nations, from the social point of view, if exploiters of labor were free to use the unfair profit coming from their reduced cost of production to get rid of their competitors. But here the object is not only material but also ideal. The thought on which it is based is that all men have a common task, which is to make the inner life richer and more perfect and not to degrade oneself to the rôle of a machine. In the work of production it is a question of arriving at a peaceful understanding and of the regulation of the question of social evolution. The idea of social pacification is nowhere more appropriate than in Germany. This imposes upon us the pleasant duty of not concluding peace without trying to make our social programme secure from the international point of view. It was a fault in our social spirit that the peace treaties concluded by Germany with Oriental peoples had a merely capitalistic character. As to suggested provisions of the peace treaty regarding labor legislation, protection of working people, and labor insurance, the Government has decided to take its stand on the ground of the proposals of the Leeds and Berne conferences. We expect the peace to make the world a pacifist organization under the form of the league of nations advocated by Mr. Wilson.

"In spite of all the difficulties, I do not renounce the hope that humanity, demoralized by the war, will gain as the fruit of its sacrifices and sufferings a new and better adjustment of the relations between peoples. It will then be possible for mutual respect gradually to take the place of hatred—respect without which no harmony can exist among men. This is the case not only with the enemy countries but also with our neighbors to the east, with whom we are now without treaty—practically in a state of war. The Russian Soviet Republic has declared to the Entente its willingness to enter upon *pourparlers* on a basis of the suspension of Bolshevist propaganda in other countries, demanding in return the right to regulate the political situation of Russia without foreign interference. So far as Germany is concerned, there need be no fear in regard to the ability to arrive at an understanding with Russia on this basis. The only condition to impose would be that Russia also should accept the right of free determination.

"The confidence which I beg you to grant me will not be influenced by the name which I have received from my ancestors. I hope to prove to you that I can be at the same time a count and a democrat, convinced that the National Assembly must decide how Germany shall end the world war. The responsibility for the treaty of peace rests upon the National Assembly, for we shall be treated by the victors according to the character of our debates and the respect which we may be able to inspire. We certainly have much to repair both at home and abroad, notably in regard to Belgium. Consequently, we have no occasion to make pompous discourses, but we are nevertheless under the obligation of saying a word in this Chamber on the subject of independence. We are beaten but not dishonored. The dignity of the people has in part been placed in my hands. I swear to defend it."

Documents

The Berne Conference and the League of Nations

THE following documents, taken from the "Official Bulletin of the International Labor and Socialist Conference" at Berne, comprise (1) the resolution of the Commission appointed to prepare a report on the question of a league of nations, submitted on February 5, and (2) an address by J. Ramsay Macdonald, one of the delegates from Great Britain, delivered immediately after the presentation of the resolution. The text of the Huysmans amendment which is summarized in the large type paragraph following the report (also taken from the "Bulletin") appears not to have been published. A few errors, apparently caused by imperfect translation, have been corrected in the text.

Resolution of the Commission on the League of Nations

The union of the peoples of the world in an intimate association has always been one of the fundamental objects of the Socialist Internationale.

This ideal arises from the solidarity of the working-classes of all the countries and from the Socialist goal which cannot be realized nationally but only internationally. Owing to the world war the Socialist ideal of the league of nations has to-day become an urgent task even for non-Socialists. It has become clear that, with the great development of military machinery and the means of transport, every war has a tendency to turn the whole world into two hostile camps which will fight each other with the most odious engines of destruction to complete exhaustion. The war just terminated has brought civilization to the edge of the abyss. The next war would destroy it completely, and even the preparation for the next war threatens it with destruction. This disaster can only be prevented by the creation of a league of nations.

This league of nations should be formed by the Parliaments of the different countries, and must be based on a real peace of justice which will not give rise to any future conflict. All the nations organized on the basis of national self-determination should be included in the league of nations. All members of this league should have equal rights and equal duties to assure the proper working of the league. Such peoples as have not yet obtained self-determination should, under the protection of the league, be encouraged and assisted to fit themselves for membership in the league of free nations. The first task of the league of nations should be the prohibition of new wars and armaments.

The league must create an international court which, by means of mediation and arbitration, shall settle such disputes as have arisen or obviate such as may arise, including such as are considered vitally to interest the power or honor of the states.

This international court must have the competence, after consultation with the people concerned, to rectify frontiers when the necessity arises. The league of nations must abolish all standing armies and bring about complete disarmament. If any armed force shall be required it should be under control of the league.

The league shall dispose of the means of economic pressure to induce and enforce its decisions when necessary.

The league of nations must further prevent all economic war by the establishment of free trade, free access to all countries, the open door to the colonies, and international control of world thoroughfares. Where national tariffs exist, they should require the approval of the league of nations. The league must be given the power of development into an organ to control world production and world distribution of foodstuffs and raw materials,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a view to bringing the production of the world to the highest grade of efficiency.

The functions of the league should include the establishment, development, and control of an international labor charter.

The league of nations is being created under the pressure of conditions produced by the war. But when these conditions have lost their force, it will only be capable of powerful development and grow equal to its great task if the working-class movement in all countries stands behind the league with all its strength.

In proportion as the working-class movement in every country grows in force, as the workers become conscious of their international tasks and become more determined in their opposition to any policy of might on the part of their own Governments, in proportion, in fact, as socialism is realized and the new Socialist Internationale grows into a power, will the league be able to achieve more powerful and beneficent results.

The report of the Commission on the league of nations was unanimously adopted after the acceptance of Ramsay Macdonald's amendment demanding that the league must be composed, not of Government representatives, but of elected representatives of the Parliaments. A second amendment put forward by Huysmans demanded the recognition of the fundamental rights of all nationalities, on the lines of the arguments put forward by several Jewish speakers.

Address of J. Ramsay Macdonald

It is with feelings of profound pleasure that I speak once more at an international congress. Such a moment, when not only majorities and minorities in the various countries sit side by side to try to solve the tremendous problems which the working-classes of Europe have now to face, but also the representatives of nations that have been at war with each other up to within a few weeks ago—such a moment is one that we have hoped for, prayed for, worked for during these last four years. Profoundly significant and appropriate is it that the first serious discussion of the Conference is upon the league of nations. I shall confine my speech to one or two practical points that ought to be remembered and emphasized.

It should be remembered that there is no greater danger to any cause than that everyone should profess to believe in it. Everyone believes in the league of nations now. There is, therefore, all the more reason why the Internationale should consider what it means by a league of nations and how it desires to see the league built up. One of the most essential duties of the league of nations is to create a commission that will control the distribution of raw material, and will preserve in the economic constitution of the world those organizations created during the war which have regulated shipping, transport, and essential material in the interests of the people and not in the interests of a class. Yet all the Governments rendering life service to the league of nations, in their own countries, before going to Paris or while they are in Paris, have done everything they could to pass back their shipping to the ship-owners, and pass back all those economic elements necessary to the welfare of all the peoples to those interests who have exploited them in the past—all the more successfully owing to the enormous wealth the war has put into their pockets.

The success of the league of nations, its very existence, depends upon the character of the peace.

Give Europe a peace to-day similar to the peace imposed by Germany upon France in 1871, and they could talk "league of nations" night and day, month by month; they could create Government committees and call them a league of nations, but from the Socialist point of view there would be no league of nations at all. By making such a peace the Governments would make it impossible to secure goodwill amongst the nations. The essential foundations of the league would be missing.

The league of nations must not be associated with the spoils of war: it must not be an instrument of victory. It must be a territorial court of justice, not a police force to enforce injustice. It must enter into an inheritance of fair play, just dealing, and democratic territorial division. If it enters into any other inheritance, then every policeman it commands, every soldier it can order, will be used not for the liberty of the people, but for the purpose of keeping the people unhappy, enchained, revolutionary, and altogether in the warlike frame of mind which in 1914 enabled the Governments to plunge their people into the abyss of destruction.

The league of nations must not be an exclusive league—it must not be an alliance of certain Powers possessed of the late war emotions. The league must be a union of all the nations whose political and social development entitles them to enter. The league must not be a mere footnote to the last four years of European history. It must be an entirely new volume. The old series must be finished, bound up, and placed away upon our shelves. We must start a new volume, with a totally new spirit, with new ideas, with a new set of writers drawn from the democratic (?) of the free nations of the world.

I welcome the declaration of the German Majority Socialists about disarmament, but I was disappointed with the proposal for a citizen army. A citizen army is conscription. We in Great Britain will have nothing to do with either military or industrial conscription. Whatever the consequences may be, we would oppose such a manifestation of militarism. We would never countenance the imposition upon our children of that pernicious resource of militarism either in the form of a citizen army or in any other form. How could we create a league of nations upon the basis of a citizen army? The formation of citizen armies upon the basis of population strikes at the very root principle of the league. I appeal to the German party to knock the citizen-army proposal out of their party programme and to declare that the only safe basis for a league of nations from a military point of view is disarmament. You have to begin right. If you begin wrong, then every year that went past would find you further and further from the truth. The beginning of all evil is insignificant—the end of all evil is colossal. Why not disarm? Are the democracies going to have confidence in each other or not? Is the new German power going to be entitled to the inspiring description given of it by Eisner, which I have applauded?

The German democracy, if allowed to settle down, will be the freest democracy in Europe. The first thing to make it so is for it to declare unequivocally in favor of disarmament. The league of nations can have only one authority—a moral authority. The league is going to fail unless in the minds of the nations it establishes itself in the sacred position of a court of justice. It must fail unless the nations affected by its decisions accept those decisions as any law-abiding person would accept the decision of a court of law in his own country. Until the nations have confidence in each other there will be no real freedom, and until that confidence is secured they could limit armaments, but they could never have peace. The most insoluble problem in the world is the limitation of armaments—no man ever made could solve that problem. There is no half-way. Representing no old order, custodians of no old traditions, animated by no ancient grudge, we freely have come to shake hands with each other and forget our differences, in order that the stones upon which a secure Europe can be erected in the future may be laid, not by one hand, but by the united efforts of the peoples. We have to warn the Governments in Paris of what they are doing, and warm the hearts of all the democracies in Europe at the same time. In that spirit our pronouncement on disarmament should be made.

The resolution put forward by the Commission is a little weak in one particular. I do not think the powers of Parliament have been sufficiently emphasized, and I suggest that the following should be inserted after the words "any further conflict" in the third paragraph:

"Representation in the central organ of the league shall be, not by delegates of the Executive branches of the Governments of the constituted states, but by delegates from the Parliaments representing all parties therein, ensuring thus, not an alliance of Cabinets or Governments, but a union of peoples."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I desire to emphasize this point as I want the people to be the soul of the league—not the red-tape of Foreign Offices. The contact which the league is to establish ought not to be one of the administrative tops of states, but of the masses and the public opinion of the states.

I would want the league to be inspired by the strong, vigorous air of democracy. It must not be a breathless thing, dominating a bloodless body which dominates a lifeless Foreign Office. I don't want such a league. It is doomed to failure, because it would deprive itself of the democratic driving force which should be its true vitality.

The league to which I object is the sort of league which the Governments at Paris apparently want to impose upon the people. All that has so far been announced is that the Prime Ministers of the various states should meet once a year—a proposal that was an insult to the peoples of Europe and no compliment to the intelligence of any of them. Such a league would be no better than the Holy Alliance of a hundred years ago.

As to the [attitude of the] Governments to Russia at the moment, it is like the attitude of the Italy [Holy?] Alliance to the liberal movement in Spain in 1820-1822. Russia has been singled out for disapprobation not for her crimes, but because of her new political policy—her new conception of government and international relationships; whether it is good or bad is not of concern at the moment. There are atrocities and tyranny elsewhere and they were not challenged elsewhere. So it was because of the new political and social conceptions animating Russia that she was treated as an enemy.

A league of nations formed on such a basis would be merely a league of Governments, not to secure liberty, not to safeguard or advance it, not to say to any agitating public, "Bring your case before us so that we can hear it and judge it." Such a league would be a menace to and not a protector of liberty. The league we desire to see is a court to which all oppressed nations could come, bring their complaints, make their charges, and ask for judgment, and where they will be assured of receiving justice, fair play, and an honorable judgment. Then it must not be a league of Governments.

The league must have legislative functions. It should determine peace or war, make economic arrangements, decide whether a nation is to be punished or not, and settle whether soldiers have to march across frontiers. Are we going to place in the hands of a league of Governments, a league of Cabinets, the power to make peace or war? I am not going to do this. At this moment, owing to our war experiences, movements are beginning to limit and control executive power in democratic governments, but if these national executives are united in a league, acting internationally, they will have greater authority than they had even in the old days in their own national governments. A league of nations must not be an expedient for restoring to weakened national Executives the powers taken from them by the national Parliaments. Our league of nations must be published to the world as a league of Parliaments—a league of peoples. It must not be an international Executive. Unless that is made clear, at any negotiations that may take place the people would find something very much akin to the Holy Alliance which would be imposed upon them, dressed up in a democratic garb and appealing for confidence in democratic language. So it comes to this, that we must make it plain that we are in favor only of such a league of nations as will secure eternal peace without oppressing liberty. Such a league can be established only under the circumstances defined in the resolution—a just peace being essential now. Above all, the league must be the expression of international democracy.

When the democracies unite—when this Conference, representing twenty-six countries, becomes a mirror of the nations, the old historical differences, the suspicions, the enmities, the hatreds, will disappear, sink out of sight forever. Then we and they and all of them, and particularly this Conference at Berne, will be memorable forever in history for having taken the first substantial step towards the union of the whole human race.

A Speech of Kurt Eisner

THE speech of Kurt Eisner, at the time Premier of Bavaria, before the International Labor and Socialist Conference at Berne on February 3, was reported at some length in *La France Libre* (Paris) of February 5, where it was characterized as of historical importance. Eisner spoke in the name of the Independent Socialists, in reply both to the attacks of the French Socialists upon the German Majority Socialists and to their defence by Wels. A fuller version of the speech, a translation of which is given below, was published in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of February 5. The two versions show numerous variations, and neither agrees with an abbreviated version printed in the "Official Bulletin" of the Conference. As a result of this speech Eisner predicted his own death, which occurred on February 21 by assassination. An interesting reference to the speech will be found in Mr. O. G. Villard's letter from Berne, published in the *Nation* of March 15.

Eisner began by saying that the French comrades who had spoken had voiced more of lamentation than of accusation.

He spoke of the great need that the beginning of a new league of peoples should grow out of the first meeting of the Internationale. Complete openness and truthfulness between comrades in all countries were the necessary conditions—and in this Eisner agreed with Thomas—of a true understanding. For this reason the Germans neither should nor would refrain from discussing the question of guilt. The object of the discussion was to lift us out of the madness and lying of these times. Eisner then pointed out that it was not an easy thing for a member of a defeated people to speak here, and said that he would avoid throwing stones at what was already dead. He declared it to be his deepest conviction that the German people need a united Social Democracy in order to enable them to support the tremendous changes of the present time. Germany must expiate her heavy guilt before the Internationale by marching ahead on the road to socialism, but in order to do this she must be in agreement with the comrades of the former enemy countries with whom German Social Democracy is fighting shoulder to shoulder.

Eisner then spoke of the character of the German revolution, and affirmed that it had most profoundly changed the masses of the people, and that nowhere in the world is the determination of the masses to develop the new popular control in the Socialist spirit so powerful as it is in Germany. The fact that in the elections the German masses had overwhelmingly spoken for the Majority Socialists, who had not broken down the German war policy of the fallen Government, should not be regarded as a sign that the German people had not changed. The German Socialist masses did not care about the divisions in the party, but they voted Socialist because the Social Democracy had overthrown the Government and dynasties, and therewith the whole war policy.

Eisner then made a lengthy attack upon the speech of Wels on the preceding day, which he characterized as not very intelligible. Wels, by seeking to throw the responsibility for the outbreak of the war upon capitalism in general, brought the German revolution under the suspicion of having overthrown its rulers, not out of moral conviction, but only because they were the weaker party, and from a wish to make use of the opportunity to overturn them. Certainly, the German Government knew very well how to throw dust in the eyes of the German people, and a week before the outbreak of the war Eisner himself expressed the opinion in Munich that Germany was threatened by the Russian invasion and that the war was a war of defence. But as soon as the first German White Book appeared, it was clear to him that the German people had been duped by their leaders, and that the guilt and responsibility of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German Government were no longer doubtful. There has been no war in history in which, during the war itself, every one who chose could attain full historical certitude as to the responsibility for it. Even the bourgeois classes in Germany now no longer deny the guilt of the Government as to the war; they merely say that the people cannot be made responsible for it, since for four and a half years they were uninterruptedly lied to. The German Majority party and its representatives here must at last frankly admit that for four and a half years they had been caught in a maze of errors. The Majority defence that they had to stand by the war because otherwise the support of the German people would have been lost, and that as a consequence the collapse of Germany would then have taken place, does not hold water. Even if they could deceive themselves as to the character of the war, at least they should not have let themselves be deceived as to the outlook for the war. Consequently, it had been the duty of the German Social Democracy to take a position against the war and so to earn for themselves the right, when the moment of Germany's collapse arrived, to bring moral aid to their country. It is certain that the war was made by a horde of megalomaniac military men who were allied with the metal industry, capitalists, and princes, without any political foresight or any military insight—a riddle easily understood when it is known that certain military theorists believed that Germany was bound to win victory in a few days or weeks. These gentlemen were enthusiastic for the war as a prophylactic against Socialist infection. After war had been declared, and the responsibility for the war had become clear by the end of a fortnight, the German Social Democracy should have overthrown the Government, conquered for itself political power, and offered peace. The German revolution came four and a half years too late, and therefore to foreign countries it has the appearance of a mere outbreak of despair and is not regarded as the act of a brave people.

Eisner then defended himself against the reproach of bourgeois and Socialist leaders in Germany that he had strengthened the imperialism of the enemy by his well-known publications (of secret documents). It was his conviction that the truth must be spoken even if Germany itself had been thereby brought to the ground. But these revelations, these truths, had not injured Germany at all. Eisner of late had been attacking especially the German Majority Socialists. Eisner declared that it had been their duty, as recognized revolutionists, unsparingly to expose the crime of the old system, for only so could the new Internationale come into being. The Majority party must openly acknowledge its fault and declare that it is now finally done with it. The party has incurred such heavy guilt during the war because it not only lengthened the war by its policy, but had helped to cast Germany into the abyss. Eisner then spoke of the sufferings of the German people, which are nothing short of brutal. The German people are the victims of the German lust for organization, the victims of scientific thoroughness and system. The poor German people have nothing to do with the crimes of their rulers, for they were prevented from knowing the truth by a system of lies. Having driven out its princes, overthrown the Government, established democracy, and being in process of creating socialism, they have the right to work in common with other peoples in the upbuilding of the new world, and they should not have their fredom taken from them and be degraded to the condition of slave debtors of foreign capitalists. The German people have lost more victims in the war against war than any other people. This is evidenced by the thousands languishing in prison because they dared to stand against the rulers and against the war. The German revolution, accordingly, is not the result of collapse but the fruit of quiet, indefatigable, progressive labor, which began at the very time when military Germany was apparently at the height of its power, as the violently suppressed strike movements in January, 1918, show.

Eisner affirmed that the revolution in Bavaria, in particular, is a real revolution which has been spiritually prepared for years. The German revolutionary Social Democracy is alive, not as the old Social Democracy, but as a fundamentally new democracy unwilling any longer to compromise with the past. German Social Democracy neither should nor will play the part of judging the guilty, whose penalty it is to live somewhere in hiding. We wish to create a Social Democracy which shall draw the whole people into coöperation. We want to expiate our heavy guilt by marching ahead on the road to socialism. Eisner turned to the Socialists of the Allied countries, asking them to give their hands to the Germans and, united with them, to fight the common enemy in common. If unworthiness is to be imputed to the German people, the people would rather perish than admit such imputations. The great Jaurès prophetically declared that the new world will emerge at last after a deluge of blood. Therefore we must help one another now to build up this new world, and we should not leave Berne before we have vowed to fight loyally until death for freedom and humanity under socialism. This socialism must now be led to victory. We live to-day and to-day we will act.

Native Races and Peace Terms

THE following memorial from the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society of London, dated January 22, is addressed to the Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. A letter from the secretary of the Society states that the Society "has been for some time in communication" with the Foreign Office "regarding native races' interests in the settlement of the dependencies as a result of the war."

SIR: We beg to submit for your consideration reasons which, in our opinion, justify the hope that, when negotiations for peace become possible, it may be both desirable and practicable to secure promise of some further international action for the preservation of native races, and also for amending existing international obligations which have for their object the safeguarding of the rights and liberties of native tribes in the tropical and sub-tropical regions of the world.

We do not suggest that the difficult task of arranging peace terms should be complicated by an immediate and detailed consideration of the treatment of native races, but we submit that there are very strong reasons why Great Britain should propose that, within a reasonable period after the declaration of peace, the European and American Powers should meet again to amend and strengthen existing international agreements. We would also point out that such a step appears to be not only morally imperative, but in the truest interest of the colonizing Powers no less than that of the native peoples, because the white races have become largely dependent on the colored races for a large proportion of their food stuffs and raw material.

1. Whatever the final outcome of European hostilities may be, it is quite clear that the political status of large areas of tropical and sub-tropical territories will be vitally affected. An ideal step would be that before such changes take place the inhabitants should be given a voice in shaping their own destiny. We admit, however, that so far as most territories are concerned, this would not be a practical proposal. But this very fact appears to make it more than ever incumbent on the stronger Powers to devise means for adequately safeguarding the rights and welfare of the native inhabitants.

2. It is now twenty-six and thirty-two years respectively since the Brussels and Berlin Anti-Slavery Conferences were held, and although neither of these international gatherings, or the Acts which arose out of them, accomplished all that was hoped from them, it is incontestable that these, like their predecessors, raised to a higher level than before the accepted administrative and commercial standards for the treatment of native races.

3. It will be admitted that the last twenty-five years have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

witnessed in tropical and sub-tropical territories the most deplorable treatment of native peoples, which has resulted in an appalling depopulation reaching several millions. Apart from humanitarian considerations, this represents a grave disaster to industrial progress which is only possible in such countries by the help of an adequate supply of willing indigenous labor.

4. The sufferings through which many of these native tribes have passed during the last twenty-five years, coupled with certain eminently successful administrative experiments, have taught students of colonization certain lessons, which, we submit, point the way to desirable reforms.

5. The chief causes of depopulation may be grouped under the four heads of (1) labor abuses, (2) the unrestricted sale of spirituous liquors, (3) diseases, and (4) sexual irregularities. We leave to scientific and other bodies the highly technical problems arising out of disease and drink, and content ourselves with indicating in the appended memorandum a few directions in which the adoption of reasonable reforms would secure far-reaching social and economic rewards, and which, if they could be secured, would, in our opinion, tend to improve the relations existing between the races, as they would also tend to the preservation and increase of native life and happiness.

SUGGESTED REFORMS.

(1) RESERVE AREAS OF LAND.—Experience has shown the social and economic advantage of setting aside a large area or areas in every dependency of suitable lands for the exclusive and secure use of native tribes, at the same time making provision for the entrance of white missionary and administrative forces to guide these tribes in the evolution of a sound administration of purely native affairs.

(2) LABOR.—Labor abuses have arisen mainly through forced labor and "transfers" of persons for financial consideration, fraudulent and unreasonable contracts, and punishments for breaches of contract.

(*a*) *Acts of Slave-trading.*—The transfer of a laborer to a third party for a financial consideration, without any reference to the laborer concerned, is in fact an act of slave traffic and should be so declared by international agreements.

(*b*) *Forced Labor.*—If it were deemed impossible to secure international agreement for the total abolition of forced labor, it should not be difficult to obtain a collective condemnation by the European and American Powers of *forced labor for private profit*, which, it will be remembered, British Secretaries of State have declared to be indistinguishable from slavery.

(*c*) *Contracted Laborers.*—It should not be impossible to fix a maximum period for agricultural and mining contracts respectively, with freedom for the laborer to offer his services to any employer at the expiration of any such original contract. It is generally admitted that mining contracts of six months' duration, with intervals for visiting the tribal homes, becomes so attractive that recruiting expenses are greatly reduced, whilst the short underground contract followed by periods of open-air occupation minimizes in a marked manner the ravages of phthisis.

The whole tone of the treatment of native labor would be raised if it were possible to secure by international agreement that travelling expenses from the home of contracted laborers to their employment and back again should be covered by the employer.

A way can and should be found by which criminal punishments for breaches of civil labor contracts should be abolished.

The principle of deferred payment of wages for natives is being adopted by several Governments with good results, where the accumulated wages are treated as trust funds subject to periodic audit, and should be internationally approved.

(*d*) The practice of appointing Protectors of native labor adopted by most colonial dependencies, whilst frutiful of some good, would prove infinitely more beneficial if such offices were in the patronage of the country from which the laborers are secured, and were filled by men capable of speaking the language of the native laborers which they are appointed to protect.

(*e*) Lord Salisbury, in his memorable dispatch of 1876 to the Indian Government, subscribed in firm language to the principle of the potential citizenship of Indian emigrant labor. The adherence of the European and American Powers to this principle as an integral part of the emigration and immigration of labor is not merely an overdue reform, but one of the soundest principles of colonial policy.

(3) CONVICT LEASING.—The leasing of convicts to private interests has invariably led to abuse, and should be abolished by international agreement.

(4) LYNCHING.—The practice of lynching negroes and other colored people is not only barbarous, but a grave blot upon any civilized Government, and it casts such a stigma upon the white races that lynching should, we suggest, be internationally condemned.

(5) SEXUAL ABUSES.—The deplorable sexual relations which often prevail in dependencies where colored races predominate are so scandalous that some steps should be taken to mitigate the evil. The practice now adopted by Belgium of dismissing from the service any civil or military official found suffering from venereal diseases has proved very fruitful in restricting the abuses and diseases arising from sexual irregularities between white men and colored women.

(6) NATIVE CUSTOMARY LAW.—The hasty abolition of native law has frequently led to so much confusion and injustice that the Powers might consider the undesirability of abolishing native customary law, especially as regards land.

We have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servants,

For the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society:

T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, President.
TRAVERS BUXTON, Secretary.
JOHN H. HARRIS, Organizing Secretary.

For the Edinburgh Committee for the Protection of Native Races:

G. F. BARBOUR, Chairman
JOHN COWAN, Vice-Chairman
Joint Conveners.

For the Glasgow Committee for the Protection of Native Races:

SAMUEL CHISHOLM, Chairman.
RICHARD HUNTER, Vice-Chairman.

A German Appeal

THE following letter, printed in English and distributed by the Soldiers' Council at Ruhleben, was brought out of Germany in the middle of January by a British prisoner on his way to England from the Ruhleben prison camp:

GENTLEMEN: In this historical moment when you are regaining your freedom by the opening of the gates at Ruhleben, we are asking you to take these lines with you to England and to let them be known to your countrymen. You are the crown witnesses of the revolution; you are the first ones who leave our country after it. Therefore you are in the best position to announce to the world the truth about what is happening. Examine justly what you have seen, the events in the camp as well as in Berlin lately, judge impartially, and we are convinced that you will act as our speakers.

It took four long years for the German people, the people themselves, who never have hated you, to come into their own. It took four years of endless privations and sufferings to make our people realize that they had been ill-guided and misled. By that you may realize the great strength of the party in power which had to be defeated, but you may also realize the greatness of the disaffection among the people by the quickness and thoroughness of their action. By their disciplined organization the Conservative party, which is out of power now, has itself furnished the weapon which the people turned against it for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deliverance of the nation, for the end of the bloodshed, and for the great German Republic. The four years spent in this camp have left their marks on some of you; some regret the loss of a friend, some have been losing their health, not to speak of financial losses. Do not hold the German people responsible for it; it has suffered more than you. For you the English Government provided amply and you are able to realize the misery and sufferings of the population in Germany.

Please remember how the fall of the old Government was followed by the entry of a new spirit in the camp, the spirit of freedom which endeavored to alleviate as far as possible the last days you had to spend in the camp.

You are leaving the camp with your heads high, bound for freedom and home. History will record the years you have spent in the camp, and how you have bravely borne your captivity. Freedom and all it means follow four years of privations and sorrows. We congratulate you on your bearing, that nothing ever broke your spirit or made you lose faith.

The German people are now on the path to freedom. After four years of a war into which it was dragged against its wish—years associated with misery and privations—the German people has liberated itself from internment, an interment which weighed very much more heavily on the people than the few restrictions to which you were subjected in Ruhleben. The people were the slaves of a barbaric system without parallel in history, which enforced its dictates with brutal severity. Like you, the German people now stands at the open door of liberty, almost blinded by the brightness of the light emanating from the sun of freedom which since November 9 illuminates all. The people are still amazed by the rapidity with which the change was effected, but even in the short time so much has been accomplished by the German people that even its enemies should not treat it with contempt.

Therefore, leave without any ill-feeling or hatred, and do not hold the German people responsible for the deeds committed by its former autocratic leaders.

For this reason we ask you to make known to all what you have seen when in Berlin and during the journey through Germany. Tell your countrymen that the revolution was short and caused almost no loss of life, and for these very reasons was all the more thorough and complete. Tell them at home that the former ruling classes are utterly powerless, and the German people has taken firmly the reins of government in its hands. Tell them that perfect order prevails in Germany, in spite of the upheaval, and this order is maintained by the individual citizen. Neither the conservatives nor the extremists show any signs of attempting a counter-movement; all the soldiers, requested by their delegates, have placed themselves at the service of the People's Government; and should any signs of terrorism appear, the people know that they may reckon on the soldiers to deal effectively with its prepetrators. Tell them that the Social Democrats are proud of having brought about the revolution, and the whole nation is indebted to them for what they have accomplished. The party does not intend to establish a new autocracy in the place of the one which it has swept away, but knows that it can appeal to the whole nation to decide, when the people record their votes on the most liberal electoral system in the world.

Tell them that you have yourself experienced the privations that Germany had to suffer; it would be a grievous mistake to prevent the supply of foodstuffs merely because some excitement still prevails, but the proper course would be to supply Germany's wants as a means of allaying the tension. Hunger drives many into the ranks of the terrorists, hence an adequate supply of food is the best remedy.

And now, gentlemen, good-bye. Give our greetings to our comrades and brothers across the Channel. Tell our countrymen in England that now Germany has cast off its chains, that on their return they will find a free, united Germany. The new Germany appeals to all its citizens to place their best efforts in the service of the common cause, for the welfare of the great German People's Republic, that it may take its proper place in the society of nations. Long live our newly acquired freedom, long live the Republic, long live the society of nations, long live peace!

For the Soldiers' Council, Englanderlager, Ruhleben.

(Signed) ZIRWES, PLUMER, WOLFF, BEER, KIESER, SCHUTZE

Declaration of the French Intellectuals

THE following manifesto of the "fighting intellectuals of France" appeared in the *Populaire* (Paris) of January 17.

TO THE FIGHTING INTELLECTUALS OF THE WORLD:

In spite of the blood with which our hands have been covered despite ourselves, our hands are ready to-day to rebuild the world in harmony with all of you. Although a close fraternity with our own countrymen kept us opposed in battle, should the memory and even the tragic remorse of having been, for more than four years, the bearers of massacre and barrenness, still separate us?

Our spirit has always ruled the battle with lofty purposes. Pity has consumed us like an internal flame. We have spoken the truth, we have not believed lies, and although we have marched against one another, we have struck one another like brothers in a bout and we have clasped one another like gladiators in the sand.

The fact is that we have all given ourselves as a burnt offering in order that the survivors among us might proclaim, with irresistible force, our thought, the clear thought which must kill that other, the one in whose name people think we were marching.

What reactionary, what old doctrine of death will dare to arise, what unspeakable passions will dare to confess themselves against us?

We do not intend to be used to continue the war after peace has been declared.

Fighting intellectuals of that country which yesterday was our enemy, we are eager to renew contact with your minds and your hearts.

Fighting intellectuals of the world, we know that there are innumerable among you who feel as we do, and that, for fifty months, you have acted the part of criminals behind the serenity of your honest souls. We have the good and solemn duty of setting an example of wisdom to-day. We must be the first to hold out our arms, since, above the multitudes released by the pressure within each nation, above the great intellectuals who have failed in their mission of morality, above all the spiritual or popular powers overthrown, we alone, under the clash of fire and of steel which covered the green earth with shell holes, have had the courage to retain our faith in the dignity of man and in the sound and enlightening power of reason.

Wilson has been our powerful friend. His voice has been ours. Our voice has been his in spite of everything and everybody.

Fighting intellectuals of the whole world, we extend our hands to you as brothers, in sane contempt for hereditary enmities.

Our task of to-morrow will be harder and more formidable than that of yesterday.

It brings us constantly face to face with our own consciences, in the midst of the persecutions of a barbarous and dying nationalism. Our close union will be our strength.

It is time for us, in our respective countries, to rise against the instigators of wars and of disorders.

It is for us, who cannot be attacked from the national point of view and have given adequate pledge of our faith in the peace of the peoples, to rebuild from now on for the safety of the members of the International Alliance of Thought.

Fighting intellectuals of the whole world, let us unite!

H. BARBUSSE, ROY-LEFEBVRE, P. VAILLANT-CONTURIER, G. VIDAL, H. TORRES, H. BERAULT, H. REGNAULT, A. MERCEREAU, NOEL GARNIER FONTANILLE, J. D'ESPOUY A. LE FIQUER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Press

"While They Dance the Tango"

UNDER the above title *L'Europe Nouvelle* of February 1 comments editorially, over the initials "E. N.," upon the danger of public indifference in the present world situation.

There is fighting in Siberia. There is fighting in Esthonia. There is fighting in the Ukraine. Blood is flowing in all the Russias. Poles and Czechs are cutting one another's throats in Silesia. Jugoslavs and Italians challenge one another and heavy clouds are rolling up over the shores of the Adriatic. Nevertheless, at Paris they are dancing the tango.

Germany has pulled itself together. Spartacism is checked. The Majority Socialists have failed to secure a majority. The Government is making a great effort for the maintenance of unity and centralization in the old Empire. Hindenburg is massing an army on the Polish frontier. The great general staff has celebrated the Emperor's birthday; the newly elected members of the People's party (the old National Liberal party) have sent him an address, and the rooms of the Imperial couple are filled with flowers. Nevertheless, in the reopened bars of Montmartre the tango is the rage.

The Council of Ten is deliberating in secret on the fate of the peoples. And these peoples know nothing or almost nothing of its deliberations. The blood shed yesterday in floods has not given them the right to know. They have not all of them, as yet, even the right to be heard. Mutes of the red seraglio, they have only to bow before the law of silence.

Nevertheless, little by little, the heroes of yesterday are returning to their homes. During these hard years of constant sacrifice, every day face to face with death, in the mud, in the rain, the snow, or the burning sun, they have lost the sense of the relative value of things. Wine, meat, bread were distributed to them without their knowing what they cost. They had other things to worry over, poor fellows! They come back. *Pinard* has become a drink for millionaires. Coal is scarce in the house, meat scarcer still; the meagre bit dancing in the middle of the platter among a few potatoes or lentils has left the housekeeper's purse empty since morning. What distress this means if between father and mother room must be found at the table for fair little heads! And the smallest piece of clothing! And the most modest footwear! And to-morrow? To-morrow the allowance will have been devoured, the landlord will be demanding his rent, and the tax collector his taxes. And what taxes!

In the social structure, shaken by the heavy and frequent blows of a savage conflict, dull crackings are to be heard. Here it is unemployment, a ferment of privations, poverty, and bitterness. There it is strikes, suddenly breaking out. After all, one must live, and to live one must eat. The movements in the [line deleted by French censor]. They begin to manifest themselves in France, and serious incidents such as the disciplined refusal of discipline on the P. L. M. railway lines after the sudden transportation strike in the capital—are these not an impressive indication that this agitation is not a mere eddy, but the assertion of a powerful organization whose machinery was set going to see how it worked? The experiment has shown that the mechanism worked, that it worked only too well.

The trade union "gesture" has been met by a "gesture" of authority and firmness. So be it, but the trouble is still there; the deep-seated causes remain. A policy of "gestures" is no policy. A Government of repression is not a Government of social peace, it is a Government of social war, at the mercy of every hazard, for only a Government which has allowed itself to be surprised by events is driven to repression. To govern is to foresee.

The evil which threatens our social structure to-day is the high cost of living. This evil, serious whenever it occurs, may become, if not promptly remedied, a catastrophe in a period like the present, when the entire national organism, human as well as industrial, has to readjust itself to new conditions of existence. The high cost of living means disturbance in the home, and this disturbance may quickly pass from the home into the street. But it means also disturbance in the whole national economy, for it upsets wage relations, with resulting disturbance in fixing industrial costs and in the relative value of the purchasing power of money. It means general disequilibrium and this disequilibrium manifests itself, in the economic order by industrial paralysis, in the political by disorder. It is a fatal sequence. History has always inexorably recorded it. Yet history has never until now had to record a cataclysm so formidable as that of which the first act has scarcely closed.

I say the first act, for I have come to ask myself if there will not be a second. After the military shock, who will guarantee us against the social shock? The volcano is grumbling. Nevertheless, in our Parisian salons the tango resumes its reign.

Have we the right to persist in forgetting the lessons of history? I believe that there is not a moment to be lost. If I am wrong, so much the better. Unfortunately I do not feel as if I were. I am not alone. If the head of the Government is too much absorbed by the grave labors of the conference, let him delegate his powers to a man capable of grasping the problem as a whole and of harmonizing, with a view to its solution, all the parts of the mechanism that are capable of helping. Men like Clémentel and Boret are bankrupt. France needs a custodian of the stomach, more than that, indeed—for the problem is not one of food only—an economic dictator, large-minded, enlightened, firm-handed.

Otherwise, through lack of foresight, inertia, and weakness we are going to fail our dead and bungle our victory. The danger which threatens us is not only on the Rhine, not only on the Vistula and the Muscovite steppes, it is at the very heart of the country. It is in the markets, it is at the monopolist's, the profiteer's. [Four lines deleted by French censor] . . . our soldiers, returned home, will set up gibbets for some grocers or butchers. [Three lines censored.] But what would then be danced in the cabarets and salons would no longer be the tango.

Political Parties in Croatia

IN view of the difficulty of getting unbiassed information regarding political currents in Croatia, the following account of the policies of two of the various Croatian parties is of interest. The article was published as special correspondence from Agram in the *Temps* (Paris) of February 18.

I have asked the principal Croatian groups for a declaration of their stand with regard to the present problems of the Jugoslavs. I transcribe them faithfully here, having received them for the most part in writing.

The Frank party—its real name is the Croatian party of the Right—is third in importance in Croatia and until now has been the instrument of Austrian politics, believing in the attainment by means of the Hapsburgs of that "union of Croatian countries" which was always its motto. This party includes particularly the non-Slav elements, but the Croatian clericals have joined it through opposition to Serbian orthodoxy. This political group preserves an undeniable influence. This influence will certainly not diminish, for the Frank party will rally to itself the malcontents of the new régime, at any rate the most irreconcilable, the timid going to swell the ranks of the Starchevich party.

The leader of the Frank Party, Doctor Prebec, explained the attitude of his group to me as follows:

"We sought to realize this union under the seeptre of the King of Croatia, Emperor of Austria, having no hope that our liberties could ever come to us outside the framework of the Dual Monarchy. When we saw this liberty dawning in a quite different

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quarter from where we had expected it our party, having no further *raison d'être*, decided to dissolve, believing that Croatian unification with the safeguarding and even the extension of our rights would be effected under the Jugoslav formula, and accepting this unexpected solution with enthusiasm. Our dissolution was announced on October 29. We were convinced at that time that our Croatian countries were to constitute a republican state within the system of a Jugoslav confederation. Our beliefs were only illusions, as we were to discover only too soon. In reality those about us were working for the upbuilding of a Great Serbia whose name only was changed.

"Under these circumstances, the party reconstituted itself in order to take up again the defence of Croatian rights. From that day we have been persecuted, and our organ suspended in defiance of law. Our programme is word for word that of the patriot Starchevich in 1894—that is, a demand for the thousand-year-old rights of a united Croatia, which does not at all prevent the union of this Croatia with our neighboring brother peoples. We differ from the Serbians only as to the method of this union. Our party considers it impossible to abolish by a mere stroke of the pen the profound differences existing between us. We have in common with the Serbians only the spoken language. The written language, religion, civilization, and history divided us. To aim at unity as an ideal realizable for coming generations—so much is good; to choose to consider it as the immediate and indispensable result of our common desire for union is a gross error in the sincere, and megalomania in others. This absolutely false—I might say iniquitous—point of departure will mean in the near future grave difficulties and disorders, the more serious because the argument which our opponents consider irresistible is constraint and force. We are not freed but conquered.

"Although our party constitutes an appreciable section of Croatian opinion, we have been pushed aside in public affairs under the new state of things. Our adversaries say that we count among us persons unacceptable because of their past compromises with the Hungarians; Dr. Horvat and Dr. Frank have been named. Although they deny the acts with which they are reproached—viz., the request to Budapest, at the beginning of the war, for the suppression of our national guarantees—we have asked them to leave our party. In spite of this no place has been given to us on the National Council of Zagrab [Agram], nor *a fortiori* in the pre-Parliament now meeting at Belgrade, although we have among us members elected by the people to the Hungarian Parliament. This in no wise prevents it from 'boasting that it works with the assent of all parties.' In reality it is only by a series of misuses of power that the Committee of the National Council, preponderantly Serbian, with the Coalition party, has decreed successively the monarchical form of government, recognition of the dynasty, and finally to delegate its powers to Belgrade. This same Coalition party, which represents us as pro-Austrian, was always our opponent, for we always fought against those Serbians who supported the Hungarian régime and who, by their opportunist compromises during the last ten years, have prevented the national Croatian parties from forming an opposition majority. Let it be clearly understood that it was these Serbians alone that we were fighting. Serbia otherwise we have never regarded as an enemy, but indeed as a brother in race.

"At the elections for the constituent assembly we allied ourselves with the Peasant party to support our federalist and republican programme, the only one appropriate to the début of Jugoslavia."

The Peasant party comes second as regards radicalism in the matter of separatist tendencies. In importance it is the fourth Croatian group. Its leader is the former deputy Radić, whose courageous speeches made an epoch in the Parliamentary annals of the Dual Monarchy. An extremely individual figure, himself the son of a peasant, very highly cultivated and of a powerful mind, M. Radić, whose influence on the rural classes is incontestable, might have played the beneficent rôle of a sort of Croatian Tolstoi. Unfortunately this leader of crowds, hampered by a partial blindness which shuts him from the outer world, sometimes turns to pure speculation. Too often he puts his vigorous dialectic at the service of very advanced ideals, dangerous for a simple audience.

"We are all federalists in Croatia; at bottom it is only as a matter of tactics that anyone calls himself a centralist, believing he will find this the shortest road to unity. That is a mistake. Our history has made us federalists. Our geographical situation, our orientation toward Hungary—a European state—make us federalists in order not to become dependent upon the Balkans, which are, whatever one may say, an extension of Asia. Our duty is to Europeanize these Balkans and not to Balkanize the Croatians and Slovenians.

"These questions turn, besides, on a superannuated nationalism, which ought not to be considered in connection with internal affairs. Nationalism is for outside relations. We little peoples have by no means grown greater through chauvinism; we can raise ourselves only by social effort within our own countries.

"They talk of unity, relying on external forms. The unity of our Jugoslav peoples we must seek in 'democratism' and not in centralization. There are bourgeois democracies of which France is the type; labor democracies like Germany; ours is wholly to be created, for we, a rural people, need a peasant democracy. The Croatian peasant wishes henceforth to be the active agent in politics, not to be acted upon. He wishes to see the Government no longer carried on against him in his name. He is patient, he knows how to wait, but he does not even understand a promise. One word only sounds in his ears—*nationality*. Nationalism was good in the period of the political romanticism that we were engaged in fifty years ago under the Hungarian domination. To-day, when Bolshevism is at our doors, here as elsewhere, social considerations ought to come first.

"Instead of that we are now carrying on Jugoslav politics; it is absurd. Jugoslavia is a nation only from an external point of view. Internally, it is composed of three nationalities which are profoundly differentiated by laws, constitutions, and degrees of culture. For instance, Slovenians have only 17 per cent. of illiteracy, Croatians 46, Bosnians 65, Serbians 80, Montenegrins 95. Moreover, we and the Serbs have different mental constitutions. Serbia has constituted a heroic armed camp; we, who had not even our own army, constituted a work-room. Serbia came to a life of freedom through an insurrection, she has created and maintained herself by uninterrupted wars. We, for our part, have preserved a national life by methodical cultural labor, by patient intellectual effort. Our papers and books have been our only guns during a century of struggle under foreign domination against Austria and Hungary. This wholly mental work has brought us to an understanding of Slavism; the military life of a brother people differently educated has left it in the phase of Serbianism. We have passed that stage, for we do not support any Croatianism."

Radić believes that federalism should be complete; only external affairs and finances should be centralized. He continued:

"I am not speaking of the army, for in my view we ought not to have any. The great majority of us in Croatia, I should say 99 per cent., are republican and sincerely pacifist. But we are also a heroic people who would know how to defend ourselves if necessary. We need no permanent army, otherwise with our warlike genius we should become a new Prussia. I demanded of the National Council of Zagrab that it should proclaim us a neutral power and have this neutrality recognized. If I had been listened to it would have done away with both the militarist danger and the best argument of Italy, which claims our Dalmatian coast on strategic grounds, the Italian coast being impossible to defend. . . . .

"The chief problem for Jugoslavia is the establishment of our north-eastern frontier, which should bind us to the Czechs. Magyar domination has denationalized the Croatian and Slovenian islands of population along the frontiers of Austria and Hungary which formed an unbroken chain between Czechs and Jugoslavs. To give these territories to us would be an act of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

restitution. The establishment of this common frontier is, moreover, a political necessity. I say frontier and not corridor, for that word suggests imperialism. I consider this a guarantee of stability, a factor in our Europeanization, the means of preventing our centre of gravity from being pushed south.

"Further east, in the Banat, the Batchka and Barania districts beyond the River Drave belong incontestably to Croatia. But I consider that these questions should be regulated in a broad spirit. It is the conceptions of Favre and Thiers that should guide us in building, not something provisional but something stable and final. I see the Entente endeavoring to make the Czechs and ourselves an important political factor which should maintain friendly relations with the Rumanians and Hungarians, since from the social point of view we are the same people, nations of peasants oppressed by magnates or boyars. Hungary is called to a *rapprochement* with us; it will be in so far a hold on Germanism. Paris must understand this.

"Our frontiers with Italy? There, too, we should take an elevated and long view. My fellow-countrymen seem to see only the present, the immediate. I am for a frontier established in the most friendly possible way with Italy. Our shore is only arid rock; she wants part of it for strategic reasons. Let us give her guarantees. But let there be no conflict, even a political one, to say nothing of war. We have other things to do. Let us talk it over and agree."

I draw no conclusion from these declarations because they represent only party opinions. But those in high places would do well to meditate on them in order not to commit themselves to a policy of irreparable mistakes.

Mr. Asquith's Future

CONSIDERABLE significance is perhaps to be attached to the attitude now taken by the *British Weekly*, one of the most enthusiastic of Mr. Lloyd George's supporters in the London press, towards Mr. Asquith. In an editorial of February 6 the paper laments the "dearth of first-class ability" in the Government and in Parliament, and continues:

We say that if Mr. Asquith and his principal lieutenants who are out of Parliament belonged to the present Government the gain would be immense, and the heavy loads that oppress us would be more easy to bear. To put it in the concrete: Take Mr. Asquith. Who could represent his country better on the league of nations? There are governing men who surpass him in initiative and in driving power. Is there anyone who equals him in judicial power? His marvellous memory, his strong grasp, his judicial mind, give his opinions a weight which is at least equal to that of any man of our time. When the permanent league of nations is working, why should not he and some of the best of those who think with him take a part?

The Readmittance of German Music

MR. ERNEST NEWMAN ("E. N."), writing in the Birmingham, England, *Post* before the armistice, urges that the ban on German music be lifted.

Peace with all its horrors will soon be upon us, by the look of things. For some, no doubt, it will have its compensations. The profiteer, the Government contractor, and the munition worker will be at last able to relax their noble efforts to live solely for their fellow men, and, no longer under the painful necessity of growing richer daily at the expense of the rest of us, will be able to devote the remainder of their lives to philosophic meditation. But for others of us the real trouble will begin when peace breaks out again. We had grown so used to accepting the present order of things as the only possible order of things, and to believing that it would go on forever, that it is a shock to discover that very soon the whole face of life will alter again, and, just as in 1914 and 1915, we shall have to adapt ourselves to a new order as best we can. We thought, for instance, that we had settled for good and all the question of the performance or non-performance of German music in this country; and now here it is upon us again. Once more we shall have to go through the racket of 1914; once more blood will flow, and the epithet "pro-German" will again be heard in the land.

By a great effort we can remember what happened in the first year or so of the war. A number of people were for burning all German music without exception. They were quite honest in this. They did not particularly like German music—some of them did not like music at all—and could bear with an untroubled countenance and an unbowed heart the starvation of others to whom music, and especially German music, meant a great deal. Other people were for keeping German music out because, to put it delicately, they had home-made musical goods of their own to dispose of which, in their more expansive moments, they would candidly admit were quite as good as the German. Later, when the foul German methods of conducting the war had sickened everybody, many people to whom the best German music was very precious felt that, for a time at any rate, the less they were reminded of Germany's existence the better. Still other people discovered that along with a large quantity of good music, Germany had produced a considerable quantity of bad music, and that the British public had too long accepted bad German music and bad German singing as the genuine thing, simply because it *was* German; and then the natural tendency was to find all sorts of bad German qualities in even the best German music. But while the publicists quarrelled, the public settled the matter for itself in a rough-and-ready way. Whole-hoggism would have been the truly logical thing, but in the way of whole-hoggism stood certain difficulties, practical and theoretical. People discovered that with *all* German music banned their pleasure in concerts would be materially lessened; a season anywhere would have run rather thin without Bach and Handel and Mozart and Haydn and Beethoven and Wagner and Schubert and Schumann and Weber and Brahms and about a dozen others. Then a great, a startling discovery was made—that some German composers had been dead for a long time. The logical mind of our race instantly leaped to the conclusion that, in consequence, none of these dead composers could be held to have been answerable for the war. It was also discovered that, by a strange but fortunate coincidence, nearly all the German music that people most ardently desired to hear was the work of German composers now dead. This gave us the opportunity to save at once our concerts and our faces; we could now indulge freely without the sense of sin. But even the living German composer sneaked in sometimes, and nobody seemed greatly to mind. "Hänsel and Gretel" has been given several times in Birmingham, and drew good audiences each time. More than once songs by living German composers like Strauss have crept into our programmes, yet the necessity never arose of calling upon the Head Constable to read the Riot Act to a maddened audience. The British public, in fact, did what it always does. It indulged to the top of its bent in what, in our moments of self-flattery, we call "the national genius for compromise"—that is to say, in less flattering terms, the national genius for shirking the painful business of looking facts in the face, and of thinking things out from their foundations to their logical conclusion. Thinking is hard; it is so much easier to drift, to do what is most pleasant at the moment and find good moral reasons for it afterwards.

So we reached, at last, a decent working compromise; and now, just when we have almost come to regard the compromise as permanent, we are faced with the plaguey problem of thinking the whole situation out afresh. No one, surely, outside a lunatic asylum will maintain that *never* is contemporary Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man music to be heard again in this country. It is bound to come in again some day, and the question is, when will that day be? For other products of the German mind will not be barred. Even now German books are being issued in English translations. The student, the politician, the scientist, the manufacturer will each in the future, not merely desire to know, but find it necessary to know, what is being done by the best German brains in his own sphere of work. Can it be supposed that any final good purpose will be served by keeping the best modern German music away from our students and our audiences?

The Flemish Situation

THE following view of the condition of Ghent and the Flemish situation generally was presented by Emiel Hullebroeck, the Flemish singer, after a recent visit to Ghent. The article is taken from the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant.*

No one would now recognize the happy old town. Ghent no longer is what it has been for so many centuries. It is a town bleeding from a thousand wounds. The fine old façades along the well-kept streets are dirty beyond description. Neither brush nor fresh paint has touched them for more than four years. Everywhere the windowpanes have been demolished. They never were replaced. Newspapers and old pieces of cloths and pieces of wood or an old tin can fill the hole as best they can. The street cars are neglected beyond belief, the windows and doors are gone. Every one smokes inside the cars. Why not? The people in the street are miserably clad. Their shoes and coats show signs of endless wear. Clothing stores and food shops have nothing for sale. Around the St. Peter station a great deal has been destroyed. Not only the station itself, but most of the houses have suffered severe damage. The houses in which the Germans lived for four years are in a terrible state. Many resemble pigsties. Our own house had escaped the worst consequences. Fourteen Red Cross nurses had occupied it, and they had not followed the example of many of the soldiers who destroyed everything systematically. Neither did they take the trouble to guard this foreign property for the benefit of the owner. If a waterpipe burst, very well, let it stay burst and destroy the ceilings and floors.

And then our people! Our fine old Flemish people! I did not know them any more. Everywhere the same dumb apathetic attitude of complete indifference. Nobody works. Nobody wants to work. Nobody knows any longer how to work. The soldiers from the Yser are digging and building and putting order into this chaos. But the civic population, after four years of slavery, is broken, and I wonder whether they will ever again do a stroke of work.

But what gives me most concern is the attitude of the people, the complete change in their view of life. Ghent had suffered too much to expect people to be reasonable just now. First the *furor teutonicus* was let loose upon the hapless city. Then came the wild Flemish Activist party with their sudden and violent attempt to force the Flemish language and Flemish civilization upon everybody and everything. And now the "French movement," which is just as unreasonably trying to destroy everything that is not absolutely French. Flemish is no longer heard except among the very poorest classes. The others speak French. It is terrible French, ungrammatical and full of mistakes, but it takes the mind away from the horrors and absurdities of the ill-guided Flemish activists. No one had ever thought that the activists could do so much harm in so short a time. But when we hear the stories of the stupidly annoying measures which they forced upon the population during their short period of triumph, how they have spied upon the people and have lied about their neighbors and betrayed them to the German authorities, then we Flemish people who have always fought this separatist movement can only confess our deep gratitude that we never succumbed to the German attempts to gain our support for a movement which accepted the invader as an ally.

Now, of course, the tables have been turned, and the French papers of Ghent take care that everything that goes wrong in Belgium is the fault of the Flemish part of the population. What makes the situation even more complicated is that the soldiers from the Yser, who have borne the brunt of the battle, are Flemish through and through. For four years they have been absent and do not know the stupid things committed by a small band of Flemish agitators and extremists. Upon them rests the hope for a better Flemish future. They gave their blood for the common fatherland, and they will have the support of their Flemish people, as soon as the anger caused by the Activist movement has died out.

Assassination

THE London *Herald* of March 1, discussing editorially the subject of assassination, says:

The epidemic of assassination that has broken out over Europe is to be condemned utterly and unsparingly, for its folly as well as for its wickedness. It makes not one scrap of difference whether the victim is, like M. Clemenceau, a man whose political adherence is to what we consider the bad traditions of the past, or, like Kurt Eisner, a man in whom we could put faith and hope for the future. There are no two ways about it: either it is legitimate, or it is not legitimate, to impose one's political ends by violence. We say it is not legitimate. We add that it is impossible.

But a very important corollary attaches to this statement. The only moral difference between assassination and war is that in assassination those responsible do at any rate attempt—even if they fail—to direct the violence against the particular person whom they judge guilty, whereas in war the engine of murder is employed against the admittedly innocent. It is not the war-lords who suffer in war: it is the common people, who scarcely ever know what they are fighting for, or why . . .

If, then, the epidemic of assassination is to be stopped, it must be stopped by a change of *ideas.* It cannot be stamped out by violence any more than war can be destroyed by war. This fact is fundamental. Let us try to realize its implications. Right through our civilization runs the loathsome idea of retorting upon wrong by further wrong. We in this country who support "law and order" are supporting, if only by our acquiescence, a system of vengeance involving pains and penalties as loathesome as any assassination. Some poor wretch commits a crime against property, and we shut him up for years in conditions diabolically calculated to break his spirit and shame him out of his human dignity . . .

And we are all guilty. This mania of vengeance, this lust of cruelty, this passion for punishment, is a communal, a general sin. It runs right through society, right through history, right through the dim mythologies that were before our histories began. It is the core of the legend of that "ghastly priest" of Nemi, "the priest who slew the slayer and shall himself be slain"—a legend from which we are taught to draw the origin of so much human thought and action.

The evil is in the blood of the race. *It has to be got out of it.* When a great leader like Jaurès or Kurt Eisner is struck down, just as when a politician like M. Clemenceau is attacked, it is idle, it is worse than idle, to shriek for revenge and to whip up the fires of hate against the criminals. The only solution for the age-long tragedy is to change the spirit which makes wars, which makes the barbarities of a criminal code, which teaches that might is right, which prolongs and redoubles the old evil. The only remedy for hate is love; the only remedy for war is peace.

BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE BEREA, OHIO
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

AN Inter-Allied conference of coöperative societies, attended by representatives of English, Irish, Belgian, French, Italian, Greek, Czecho-Slovak, and American organizations, met in Paris on February 7-9. Although represented, the Italian National Coöperative League protested against the calling of an exclusively Allied conference instead of the whole International Coöperative Alliance. M. Canepa, formerly Italian Minister of Food, expressed his belief that Italy could not have held out during the war without the help of the coöperatives. Nicholas Tchaikovsky stated that Russia could be reconstituted only if its national economy were based upon general coöperation or "positive Socialism," while the Czecho-Slovaks recommended that coöperation be taught in the schools of Bohemia and the great Bohemian estates farmed in such a way as to create a coöperative framework for the whole country. Charles Gide, the president of the conference, predicted that coöperation would result in what he termed an "associationist socialism." It was decided to organize material aid for coöperative societies stricken by the war, the Manchester Wholesale having already extended a credit of two and a half million francs to Belgian societies. For this purpose, an international coöperative bureau is to be organized to distribute aid in money and supplies, to furnish information, to prepare statistics, especially with regard to food, and to assist in organizing business relations among the coöperatives. The conference urged the maintenance and extension of the powers of the Inter-Allied Food Commission, the collaboration of public authorities and coöperative organizations, the reform of international economic relations, and the extension of coöperation as the economic basis of the society of nations.

A SOCIALIST congress recently held at Helsingfors, Finland —the first since the Red revolt—declared in favor of parliamentary methods as opposed to direct action. The tone of the congress was moderate, according to the correspondent of the *Social-Demokraten* (Christiania), and adopted an attitude of disapproval towards Bolshevism. The congress declared in favor of a republic in which all power, even that of electing the president, should be lodged in the Diet; and favored a law against the formation of military "guards" of any color.

A MEMORANDUM on Albanian claims has been presented to the peace conference, asking for the recognition of Albanian rights sacrificed at Berlin in 1878 and at London in 1913. The return of the territories incorporated with Montenegro as a result of the Conference of London in 1913, and of those which have been given to Serbia and to Greece, is demanded. The Albanians declare that the great majority of the population of all these territories is Albanian, although part is Orthodox in religion and is claimed on that ground by the Greeks. Attention is also called to the fact that during the war the Albanians rose against the enemy Government, and that in 1915 they allowed the Serbians to retreat across their country. The Albanian Government also asks for indemnities for the villages burned by the Greeks and for those devastated by the armies of the Central Powers. A dispatch from Athens states that reports that bands of Albanians had pillaged Greek villages, following the withdrawal of Italian troops in southern Albania, are due to the efforts of propagandists to make trouble between the Albanians and the Greeks.

RECENT industrial and agrarian changes in Rumania are outlined in a dispatch from Bucharest published in the Paris *Temps*. The lands belonging to the Crown domain have been allotted by legislative decree to peasants, to rural funds, to corporations, public and private, and to foundations of various sorts. A limit of 500 hectares (1,235 acres) is fixed for rural properties; private property in excess comes under the expropriation laws. The Department of Industry and Commerce is to be divided into a Ministry of National Economy and Commerce and a Ministry of Industry and Labor. Rumania is proceeding, in advance of action by the peace conference, to consolidate its annexation of Transylvania and the Bukowina. In accordance with a decision of the so-called National Congress of Alba-Julia, "representatives" of the two provinces, meeting with the Council of Ministers of Rumania, have voted for complete union, and provision has been made for administration. The mines of Petrochani, the property of the Hungarian state, become the patrimony of the Rumanian state and will be administered by it.

THE executive committee of the New South Wales branch of the Returned Sailors' and Soldiers' Imperial League has recently adopted resolutions protesting against the release from internment camps of enemy aliens, and demanding their deportation, "as it is believed that their free presence is an insult to all returned soldiers and a menace to the community." It was voted to send the resolution to the Acting Prime Minister, pointing out that the Prime Minister, Mr. Hughes, had expressed "the strongest opinion on this subject," and requesting that the resolution be cabled to Mr. Hughes. The committee expressed its fear that, unless immediate recognition follows, a "grave breach of the peace may occur."

A SCHEME of constitutional reform for the province of Burma, lately made public by the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Reginald Craddock, provides for a Legislative Assembly of seventy-four members, no fewer than fifty-two of whom would be elected. There would be communal representation for Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Indians, and Chinese; and five members would be nominated for native and other races and for interests not adequately represented by the elections. In respect of executive administration, the plan provides for the administration of the various branches of government by four boards—Home, Revenue and Finance, Development, and Local Self-Government. Each board would have a "non-official president" nominated by the Lieutenant-Governor from the elected members of the Assembly, three of whom are to be Burmans. Autonomous government with representation on the proposed Council of State of India, and a Secretary for Burma affairs in the Indian Government, are suggested as the ultimate goal of Burma's independent development.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandivanian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED